

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XX.

APRIL, 1916.

No. 2.

THE CONTROVERSY ABOUT THE BIBLE IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Active efforts are being made at the present time in various quarters for the reintroduction of the Bible into our public schools. This movement gives rise to a controversy very similar to the one which raged on the occasion of the elimination of the Bible as a text-book from the American public school system. The following brief historical consideration of that earlier struggle, therefore, seems appropriate at the present time.

The opposition to the Bible as a text-book began about 1840, especially in the large cities,¹⁾ and at the instigation of the Roman Catholic Church. According to Goodrich,²⁾ the Catholics at this time numbered 800,000, out of a total of about 10,000,000 church-members in the United States. The Roman Catholics favored legal exclusion of the Bible from the public schools; Daniel Webster opposed legal exclusion.³⁾

The controversy was really due to the rise of state-supported public schools. Denominational schools wanted state support; but it became the established policy of the State not to give such support. The controversy involves the interpretation of the Constitution and the question whether the Bible is a sectarian book.

1) Monroe's *Cyc. of Ed.*, I, p. 373.

2) Peter Parley's *Tales about the U. S.* (1883), p. 227.

3) Cheever, *Right of the Bible in Our Public Schools*. (New York, 1854.)

The literature called forth on both sides of this controversy is very profuse and not always to the point, but an enumeration of some of the arguments advanced on both sides may be of interest. On the one hand, it was argued that *the Bible should be retained in the public schools*:—

1) Because the American school system is called ungodly and Christless in Europe.⁴⁾

2) Because the Bible is already in the schools, and it would be unjustifiable to put it out.⁴⁾

3) Because the Bible is unsectarian, because divine. Caleb Mills puts this argument as follows: "In science there will necessarily be progress, and consequently a change of text-books will occasionally be demanded. But the text-book in morals is the production of an Author whose wisdom needs no revision, whose knowledge is susceptible of no increase, and whose benevolence admits of no question. The Bible, without note or comment, is installed in the schools of Indiana, and its continuance as the moral standard in these nurseries of her future citizens will as surely mark the period of her prosperity and grace the zenith of her glory as its exclusion would prove the precursor of her decline, the herald of her shame."⁵⁾

4) Because Christianity is part of the law of the land; hence the State has the right of religious education.⁶⁾ This was Daniel Webster's argument.

5) Because the Bible is a text-book which should not merely be read at devotions, but studied as history, as a book of moral science and practical ethics, and as a model of literary excellence, but not as theology.⁷⁾

6) Because it teaches the best morality that has ever been taught in the world, and is the basis of all the morality in the land.⁸⁾

4) Barnard's *Amer. Jour. of Ed.*, II, pp. 153—172.

5) Barnard's *Amer. Jour. of Educ.*, II, p. 485.

6) Cheever. Cf. Barnard, II, pp. 153—172.

7) Barnard's *Am. J. of Ed.*, II, p. 693.

8) *Common School Journal*, V (1843), p. 274.

7) Because "all education should proceed from man and lead to God" (Kruesi).⁹⁾

8) Because without religious principle there can be no true, dependable morality. Philip Lindsley, President of the University of Nashville, said: "Religion, which requires us to be like God, constitutes the whole of moral excellence. And in proportion as religion influences the heart and life will be the moral worth of any individual. There can be no principle of integrity, of truth, of kindness, of justice, independently of religion. Nothing does, nothing can, nothing ever will, restrain any mortal from any indulgence, pursuit, gain, or abomination which he covets, and to which no disgrace is attached, except the fear of God or, what is the same thing, *religious principle*."¹⁰⁾

9) Because Paul teaches that children should be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.¹¹⁾ (Cf. Eph. 6, 4.)

10) Because the argument against the use of the Bible can be reduced to absurdity.³⁾

11) Because the Christian cannot in good conscience send his children to a Bible-less school.³⁾

12) Because a conscience outside the Word of God is not as authoritative as one enlightened by it.³⁾

13) Because conscience knows neither majority nor minority, and therefore this question cannot be decided by majority.³⁾

14) Because the right to teach the Bible is from God Himself to mankind.³⁾ The Bible is, accordingly, not a sectarian book.

15) Because Justice Story held that the Bible is the common inheritance of the world, and that the right of a government to interfere in matters of religion is indispensable to the administration of civil justice.³⁾

9) Barnard's *Am. J. of Ed.*, V, p. 195. Cf. XVI, p. 49.

10) *Ibid.*, VIII, p. 35. Cf. Cheever.

11) *Ibid.*, X, pp. 166—186.

16) Because the exclusion of religion is a suicidal policy in education.³⁾

17) Because the State appoints the formality of an oath to be taken on the Bible.³⁾

18) Because churches and parochial schools are glaringly inadequate to the handling of the problem.³⁾

19) Because European experience, *e. g.*, the case of Scotland, shows the benefit of the Bible in the schools.³⁾

20) Because the absence of the Bible will remove public confidence in the public schools, and alienate the affections of respectable people.³⁾

21) Because it is wise to take a middle ground between technical religious instruction and none at all.¹²⁾

22) Because many families do not go to church or read it, and hence will become heathen if the Bible is not used in the schools.⁸⁾

23) Because the Bible is the best book for the exercise of the voice and for improving the taste in composition.⁸⁾

24) Because the Bible inspires civil and religious liberty.⁸⁾

25) Because the character of a child is formed before seven. An old dying man may repeat prayers in a forgotten mother-tongue. Hence the need for early religious and moral training.¹³⁾

26) Because civilization and refinement, morality and religion, follow upon the introduction of the Bible.¹⁴⁾

On the other hand, it was argued that *the Bible should not be retained in the public schools*:—

1) Because Bible-reading, like repeating the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Creed, is ritualistic, not educational.¹⁵⁾

2) Because the use of the Protestant Bible is unfair to Catholics and Jews.¹⁵⁾

12) *Proc. N. E. A.*, 1869, pp. 17—21.

13) *Barnard's Am. J. of Ed.*, I, p. 29.

14) *Abstract of Proc., Mass. Teach. Assn.*, 1845, p. 11.

15) H. C. Benedict, in *Cheever's Right of the Bible*, etc.

3) Because there is no necessary relation between religious and secular instruction.¹⁵⁾

4) Because the Koran is no more sectarian than the Bible, and yet is excluded.¹⁵⁾

5) Because the formation of moral character depends more upon the teacher than upon books.¹⁶⁾

6) Because no one can teach religion without possessing it; hence irreligious teachers defeat the purpose of religious instruction in the public schools.¹¹⁾

7) Because using the Bible in the public schools degrades it.¹⁷⁾

8) Because the use of the Bible involves the school in polemics.⁴⁾

9) Because the home, parochial and Sunday-schools, Bible-class, and Christian teachers can take care of the religious side.⁴⁾

10) Because literature (including Bible-selections) can take its place.¹⁸⁾

All this controversial argumentation resulted in the discontinuance of the use of the Bible in the schools. It also affected the character of public school readers. The development can be traced in the *Reports of Proceedings of the National Education Association*. As late as 1875, most of the teachers wanted the Bible in every school, but not by compulsion.¹⁹⁾ In 1886, it was reported that the use of the Bible was being discontinued more and more.²⁰⁾ In 1888, it was stated to be impossible to put the Bible back as sole reading-book.²¹⁾ At the 1889 meeting Catholic prelates made a definite charge that the public schools are godless.²²⁾ Already in 1856 it was said that nineteen out of every twenty text-books "put asunder what God hath joined together," namely, religion and knowledge.²³⁾

16) Barnard's *Am. J. of Ed.*, XVI, pp. 323—330.

17) *Ibid.*, X, p. 512.

18) *N. E. A. Proc.*, 1886, pp. 128—148.

19) *Ibid.*, 1875, pp. 116—124.

20) *Ibid.*, 1886, pp. 128—148.

21) *Ibid.*, 1888, pp. 57—70.

22) *Ibid.*, 1889, pp. 111—179.

23) Barnard's *Am. J. of Ed.*, I, pp. 326 ff.

Accordingly, most modern compilers of school readers consciously attempt to exclude the religious element altogether. Already at the beginning of the century this tendency was noticeable; but the common notion throughout the greater part of the last century seems to have been that a religious element, which should be free from sectarianism, might be retained, and, in fact, that moral instruction, which nearly all the readers sought to mediate, was not really possible without some basis of "general Christianity." An examination of several hundred readers, primers, and spellers of the period makes it apparent that Hon. Joseph White, for instance, in his address on "Christianity in the Public Schools" before the N. E. A. in 1869, gave a correct statement of the tendency characteristic of the period: he urged the teaching of "general Christianity" with the Bible as text-book. This was held by him and by those participating in the discussion of his paper to be a *moral* and a patriotic duty, legal, and possible. But most modern readers definitely seek the exclusion of the religious element.

The moral element, on the other hand, is commonly retained, but with a definite tendency to depend upon the teacher rather than upon the book for moral instruction. Furthermore, the emphasis upon literature in the readers has tended to eliminate the moral element as specifically such, and especially to do away with the tacking on of moral maxims in every possible connection. Of recent years, however, there has been a strong movement in certain quarters to reinstate the Bible in the school as a text-book in morals. The Chicago Women's Educational Union, for instance, published *Readings from the Bible* as a text-book in morals in 1896.²⁴⁾

In 1881, Mr. John B. Peaslee advocated the substitution of literature for the Bible in the schools.²⁵⁾ He believed this would satisfy both parties in the Bible controversy. In 1891,

24) *Readings from the Bible*. Selected for Schools, and to be Read in Unison.

25) *Education*, II (1881), pp. 150 ff.; cf. *N. E. A. Proc.*, 1886, pp. 128 to 148.

De Garmo lent the movement his support. Appalling ignorance of the Bible was soon noticed in the rising generation. This called forth an argument in favor of the unsectarian teaching of the facts of Bible-history in high schools for the sake of an appreciation of literature, which is full of Biblical references.²⁶⁾ Isaac Thomas²⁷⁾ summarizes the arguments against the Bible in the high school: 1) No book can be separated from the interest with which it was written, and be made to teach that which is only incidental. The intent of the Bible is wholly religious, and its literary character is altogether incidental. The great ignorance of the high school student must be helped by the teacher in English Literature. 2) As literature in the high school, it would get poor teaching. 3) It is beyond the boy's capacity to appreciate it as literature. 4) Whose annotated edition should be used? 5) The feeling of the plain people that the Bible is the Book of Life rather than mere literature.

Nevertheless, the present tendency is to reduce the Bible more and more to the plane of literature.²⁸⁾ Bible selections are often given in recent readers, chiefly for their literary value, especially the Twenty-third Psalm, certain Old Testament narratives, and certain parables from the Gospels.

What is the view of the State in regard to the Bible in the public schools? Two policies of State legislation have been distinguished.²⁸⁾ One policy forbids the use of any book in the public schools calculated to favor the religious tenets of any particular religious sect, leaving it to the courts to determine in a particular case whether or not a book is sectarian. The other policy, while forbidding the use of sectarian books, has left the way open for the use of the Bible. No State excludes the Bible by name. The Bible is, accordingly, never formally, but often practically, excluded from the schools.

26) *Education*, XVI (1896), pp. 362—364.

27) *School Review*, XVII (1909), pp. 705—712.

28) *Monroe's Cyc. of Ed.*, I, Art.: "Bible in the Schools."

The State has further held that the Church should teach religion, but that the State is also obliged and competent to teach morals.²⁹⁾ J. H. Crooker has delivered an argument that, because our State is secular, our schools must be non-religious, secular schools. As for the Bible in public schools, it cannot be used as religious revelation; read without comment, it becomes an object of suspicion; there are objections to its being read as literature; and morals can be taught without it.³⁰⁾ Paul H. Hanus has argued very forcibly, a) that formal or explicit instruction in religion in the public schools is undesirable, unnecessary, and, in most cases, legally impossible; and b) that religious education, including detailed instruction in the Bible, is the duty of the Church.³¹⁾

This argumentation in support of the view of the State naturally suggests a final question: What is the view of the Church in regard to this matter of the Bible in the schools and religious education? At least three different views are held. Broadly speaking, the Reformed Churches may be said to hold, in regard to religious education, that the Church should supplement the State in education. Historically, the school is a daughter of the Church; to-day the Church should supplement the public school system wherever it breaks down, especially in regard to adolescents and higher religious education, and emphasis should be laid on the Sunday-schools.³²⁾ It is further held, quite generally, that the Bible should be in the public schools, both as literature and as text-book in morals. Their argument has been put by Dr. N. H. Axtell as follows: "Now it being true that

"1. Moral culture is an absolute necessity to the existence and prosperity of the State, and that

29) *U. S. Com. Ed. Report*, 1890/91, p. 1052—53.

30) Crooker, *Problems in Amer. Society*, Ch. V. (Boston, 1889.)

31) Hanus, *Beg. in Indust. Ed. and Other Ed. Disc.*, Ch. VII. (New York, 1908.)

32) Adams, *The Church and Popular Education*. (Johns Hopkins U. Studies in Hist. and Pol. Sci., Series XVIII, No. 8.)

"2. The Bible is the best text-book of morals, whatever else it may be, and that

"3. Bible-readings elsewhere cannot be an adequate substitute for Bible-readings in the public schools, where the State undertakes to educate all her children, it follows that

"4. *There should be the reading of the Bible in the schools.*"³³⁾

The view of the Roman Catholic Church can perhaps be stated summarily as follows: a) The State should support Christian education, *i. e.*, denominational schools. The State schools to-day are godless. b) The King James Version of the Bible is a sectarian book, and should be excluded from the schools.³⁴⁾

In the view of the Lutheran Church both public schools and parochial schools are necessary. The Bible and religion in the public schools would violate the principle of separation of Church and State,³⁵⁾ which is our guarantee of religious liberty.

In this connection attention may be called to Prof. C. Abbetmeyer's discussion in the current volume of the *Lutheran Witness* (February 8 and 22, 1916), where it is forcibly argued that the State should not permit the reading of the Bible in the public schools, for the following reasons: 1) Such Bible-reading would be an act of religious worship; 2) Bible-reading in the public schools, even "without note or comment," would be "sectarian instruction"; 3) such Bible-reading would do no appreciable good, but would work great mischief; 4) such Bible-reading would be a regrettable departure from the safe American policy of the separation of Church and State.

Decorah, Iowa.

O. A. TINGELSTAD.

33) Cook, *The Nation's Book in the Nation's Schools*, p. 146. (Chicago, 1898.)

34) See, for instance, *N. E. A. Proc.*, 1889; also *Report of Catholic Educ. Assn.*, 1911.

35) *Lutheran Witness* (St. Louis, Mo.), February 13, 1913.

SENECA AND NERO.

Spending almost all of my life in endeavoring to gain a closer vision and a truer insight into the civilization of the ancient world, I have often marveled and as often grieved at two things. One was this, that divinity students, as a rule, left their classical studies behind them as soon as they could, and before they attained that maturity when wider knowledge and a mastery of life would furnish them a truer perspective. It was in a world subject to the Roman government, and resting, in the main, on Greek culture, that the religion of Christ began, and the sacred books of our faith were written, in the main, in the tongue which Alexander of Macedon had carried into Asia, books written by men who were Hebrews, one of them, Paul of Tarsus, a Roman citizen by birth. Should we not gain a truer insight of that polity of Rome and into that Hellenic civilization within which the Church of Christ arose? Contempt solves no problem, and a contemptuous phrase generally is a mask of but slight knowledge or no knowledge. The very world of the young Church reflects all this even in the nomenclature of its earliest members and converts, and the Acts of the Apostles, so largely a record of the first and greatest of Christian missionaries, are also a notable document of the Greco-Roman world. Epainetos, Stachys, Apelles, Herodian, Aristobulos, Tryphaina and Tryphosa, Persis, Asynkritos, Phlegon, Hermes, Patrobas, Hermas, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, all bore Greek names, all of them members of the first Christian Church in the capital of the world, how many of them were burned at the stake in the persecution of Nero, in 64 A. D.? Much smaller seems to have been the number of those who bore Latin names: Prisca and Aquila, Junia, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Rufus.

In one way the philosophies of the ancient world concern the divinity student much more than the poetry of the classical world: as for the *religions* of the Greeks and the Romans, they, indeed, were a feeble thing, institutional, ritual, or myths and legends, mainly of localities narrow and circumscribed, and

fairly without any appeal to conscience, character, or conduct. The philosophical systems, I say, were a very important part of that world with which the new Church had to enter into a contest. St. Paul, on the Areopagus, facing the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, and the same witness, in the golden house of Nero or on the Palatine: here are situations which indeed were typical: the culture of Greece and the world-power of Rome; we cannot, in the study of our history of the early Church, know them too well. The world, then, in which St. Paul wrought for the Master, the world of Caligula, of Claudius and Nero, was also the world of Seneca. Whoever knows better the life and times of the brilliant essayist and moralist, philosopher of the universe and for a while chief minister and counselor in the government of that world-empire, man of the world, and thinker in the cabinet, and, in a measure, prophet of righteousness, too, — whosoever gains a closer acquaintance, I say, with Seneca and his times cannot but acquire a truer and larger perspective of that supremely important generation in which St. Paul wrought and died. Both passed away as victims of Nero.

The divinity student, I say, should concern himself more with this period where classical studies and the study of the history of the Christian Church touch and overlap in a peculiar manner. My other grievance is with my own class, *viz.*, with the professional classicist. Many of them are fed on a rapture traditional indeed, but entirely fatuous. Fair and original letters in the Greek field now are pursued by an ever lessening number, and either with an assumption of esthetical felicity or with a mechanical solution of minutiae. There is notable here, very often, a painful absence of moral and historical concern. Many are like visitors in a gallery of exquisite marbles. They forget, or never realize, that this *elite* of gifted personalities lived in a pagan world, and had living relations to that pagan world. They deal with humanities indeed, but with but a very small number of aspects of actual humanity. Their vision is largely one-sided, and so falls far short of the only

truth which can be definitely and positively claimed for classical studies, to wit, historical truth. —

L. Annaeus Seneca was the son of a Roman citizen settled where his three sons were born, in Corduba, Baetica, Southern Spain. These three Senecas were, Novatus, Lucius, Mela; this latter one the father of the brilliant poet Lucan. Novatus, in time, was adopted by a wealthy rhetor, Gallio. It is he who later rose to the dignity of a proconsul of Achaia, with Corinth as the provincial capital. It was before his tribunal (Acts 18, 12 sqq.) that Paul was arraigned by the Jews of that city; it was Seneca, no doubt, to whose mediation Gallio owed that appointment, made, it would seem, at a time when Gallio's brilliant brother was the most influential person at the seat of government on the Tiber. It is to this elder brother that Seneca dedicated his essay on "Anger" and that on "Happy Life," and other works. Our philosopher himself refers to the Achaian proconsulate of his brother (*Epist.*, 104, 1): "My . . . Gallio, who, when crying and aloud, that it was a disease, inherent not in his own body, but in the locality." Marcus Seneca, the father, was himself a very extraordinary person; the mere mechanism of his mental endowment was unique. His earlier youth was contemporaneous with Cicero's last years; but he spent the stormy times of that catastrophe in the more peaceful abode of Corduba. In his old age, when his two older sons, Novatus and Lucius, had already entered upon the career of public distinction, he heeded their eager request, and repeated for them the peculiarities in style and treatment of specific themes as presented by the more eminent teachers of oratory of his younger years in Rome, the foremost of a great and influential profession, of which some, too, were Greeks. We observe here a faculty of presentation, a keen sense of literary form, and, above all, the perception of that wherein lay vigor, point, and power. These things descended to the gifted son.

I shall not fill these pages by transcribing the estimates of this or that scholar or literary critic as to the philosophy,

the public career, or the literary qualities of the brilliant Spanish Roman. Nothing is easier than pressing such fluttering leaves in one's herbarium. There are, indeed, ample data of the outward current of his life, of his ambition, of his books, to have him appear to us as he was, himself, neither embellished and idealized, nor disfigured by malice and depreciation.

Marcus Seneca, the father, a man of Equestrian rank, was one of the older time; he cherished the ideals of freedom and of the better and older republic. The philosopher refers to the old-time sternness of his father (*patris mei antiquus rigor; Helv.*, 17, 3). He was not fond of having women learned; they were to be filled with the precepts of wise living rather; in fact, he hated philosophy as a pursuit of life or as a pre-dominating concern.

Seneca was brought to Rome as an infant, literally carried in the arms of his mother's sister. The latter's husband, for sixteen years (*Helv.* 19, 6), was governor of Egypt, clearly one of the most eminent in the Equestrian class, a man of wealth and distinction, and therefore too much more of a successful courtier than Seneca's father ever could have been. The latter lived at least up to the year 34 A.D., when old Tiberius had retired, like a tiger to his cave, to the impregnable rocks of Capri.

His training with the grammaticus seems to have been long and thorough; in the retrospect of old age he counted the time lost (*Ep.*, 58, 5). We may say here, once for all, that he mastered all the literary culture then prized in the Greco-Roman world; and this we know, that, whether in verse or prose, he acquired and held a primacy in the capital of the world which was undisputed, and which opened to him the doors of the Senate and the avenue of public honors.

But the studies which engrossed him much more than Greek and Roman letters and oratory were in the domain of philosophy. He mentions three teachers, Sotion, Attalus, and Fabianus. These men gave lectures as professional teachers, on which, it seems, like the grammatici and rhetors, they sub-

sisted. These pursuits probably were of the last period of Augustus and the earlier reign of Tiberius. The formal faculties of grammar and rhetoric probably came to him with supreme ease; they did not command his soul. It was different with the concerns of wisdom. Remembering Attalus in the last years of his own life (*Ep.*, 108, 2): "Let the student be of good cheer; he will hold as much as he shall will to hold. . . . This Attalus, I recall, taught us (me and my brother Novatus), when we besieged his classroom, and were the first to arrive and the last to leave; and even as he walked along, we drew some discourses from him, not only as one equipped for those who learned from him, but meeting them half way." Favorite sayings of this philosopher abided with Seneca for life, as this one: "The recalling of deceased friends is delightful, just as certain apples are pleasantly tart, as in excessively old wine its astringency itself delights us. When, indeed, some time has elapsed, these tastes pass away, and we realize our unmixed sensuous satisfaction." Attalus was a Stoic. He was wont to say also: "I would rather Fortune had me in its camp than as its pet. I suffer at its hands, but bravely; it is well." (*Ep.*, 67, 15.) Or again: "I surely, when I heard Attalus discoursing against the faults, the wrong paths, the evils of life, — I often felt pity for our humankind and believed him a lofty being and higher than the zenith of human greatness"; or again: "An evil mind drinks the greatest part of its own venom." (*Ep.*, 1, 22.) "He himself was wont to say he was a king; but he seemed to me to be more than ruling, for he held the franchise of sitting in judgment on those who were ruling. But when he began to commend poverty, and to show how, whatever went beyond practical needs, was a superfluous weight and heavy for the bearer, my mood was often to retire from his classroom in poverty. When he began to mock our pleasures, to praise a chaste body, a sober table, a mind untainted not merely by forbidden pleasures, but even superfluous ones, I was in the mood to lay down stern laws to appetites." These, indeed, were early ideals, and Seneca intimates that they came into very

positive conflict with the life and conduct of his own generation. (*Ep.*, 108, 13—15.) We see also that the purest and earliest convictions which the youthful moralist so warmly cherished could not be, or were not, consistently maintained where the surging world without clashed with the spirit within. Compared with such nobler incentives and exemplars, mere taste and scholarly erudition were rated not very highly by Seneca. The liberal studies, so called (*Ep.*, 88), of earlier life have chiefly the value of a preparation, a fitting out; often petty and trivial and the very professors often men of base conduct. Anything may be interpreted into Homer: now he is made out a Stoic, now an Epicurean, now a Peripatetic, now an Academic, denying all dogmatic certainty. Other futile and pointless enquiries are whether Homer or Hesiod was earlier, points of age concerning Helen and Hecuba, the age of Achilles and Patroclus, the geography of the wanderings of Ulysses, and the like; whether Penelope indeed preserved her virtue, etc., etc. Another one of his cherished teachers was Fabianus, who had first been a rhetor; his literary finish is extolled by Seneca (*Ep.*, 100). He calls him inferior as a great prose writer to Cicero, Pollio, and Livy alone; he published on philosophical subjects more books than even Cicero himself. Fabianus would seem to have been of the Stoic school, which insisted on robustness of the will, and may indeed be called the philosophy of Freedom. (*De Brev. Vitae*, 10, 1); Brother Novatus attended him, too.

Sotion was the third of this clover-leaf. It is probable (from *Ep.*, 49, 2) that it was this philosopher whose instruction preceded the young Seneca's entrance upon the career of a pleader in courts. Like many gifted young men, young Seneca was susceptible to all kinds of academic influences. So to the doctrines of Pythagoras that men should abstain from meats because that food involved the destruction of life, a denial, too, of that universal brotherhood of life which to recognize and respect was one of the fundamental laws of right living. Here was the transmigration of souls, that eternal cycle of life

which all should hold in reverence, that perpetual change of abode which men, with their narrow vision, called death. The youth was mightily swayed by Sotion's appeals, and for a year actually abstained from animal food. He even believed his mental processes had gained in vigor and liveliness. But this cult greatly resembled certain forms of foreign superstition (*Ep.*, 108, 22), and under Tiberius this was dangerous, a hindrance certainly to a youth who had proposed for himself a public career. Then, too, the father had a keen aversion for all philosophy, — and young Seneca resumed current fare.

At that stage, too, he suffered from chronic catarrh (*Ep.*, 78, 2) and greatly wasted away. "Often I formed an impulsive resolution to cut short my own life; it was the gray hairs of my most affectionate father that kept me from this step. For I reflected, not how bravely *I* could die, but how *his* bravery would forsake him in his yearning for me. . . . It is to philosophy that I give the credit for the fact that I roused myself, that I recovered my health."

Seneca became a pleader in the courts. Although eloquence and forensic brilliancy no longer swayed or determined politics and large measures of public life as under the republic, still original genius in courts attracted attention and applause more than ever. Seneca was not merely supremely successful, but his manner and delivery positively outshone all his contemporaries at the Roman bar, and was acclaimed as the most brilliant achievement of the times. It was during the reign of the unspeakable Caligula (37—41 A. D.), in his forty-fourth to forty-eighth year or so, when he had also entered the Senate, that this matter brought him into a very serious conflict with that emperor himself. Seneca (*Dio Cass.*, 59, 19) once delivered a fine discourse in the presence of Caligula. That autocrat had a mania of profound and morbid antipathy against any form of eminence, particularly in oratory (*Sueton.*, *Calig.*, 53), and personally prepared speeches in which he challenged and antagonized the most conspicuous pleaders in the Senate. He even

uttered deep displeasure with Seneca's manner: "mere sand," he said, "without the binding lime."

He planned to destroy the famous Spaniard, and only abstained when one of his mistresses told him that Seneca was beset with a wasting disease and could not last long. Seneca, indeed, never seems to have been robust; his stature was far below the normal. In his old age he called himself one who differed little from a dwarf (*Ep.*, 50, 2). One of his favorite forms for striving for some degree of robustness were cold baths; this regimen he pursued even in January (*Ep.*, 83, 3).

The fashionables, indeed, of Rome hardly imitated him in such pursuits. We have a striking description of the prevailing type in Seneca's earlier manhood from his father's pen (*Sen., Rhet. Controv. J., Praef.* 8): "The mental endowments of our sluggish youth are apathetic; there is no alertness spent in the toil for a single honorable object; sleep and indifference and the zeal for evil things, a zeal more base than sleep and indifference, has taken possession of their souls. Vile pursuits of dancing and singing hold them in effeminate bondage, to groove their hair with the curling-iron, to practise a falsetto voice of womanish blandishments, to vie with women in the softness of their physical person, and to make their surface accomplished with elegancies steeped in impurity. Such is the visible type of the young men of our time." In such a generation the tremendous industry and the consuming ambition of the younger Seneca had, indeed, not many genuine rivals.

The brilliancy of his swiftly succeeding and scintillating epigrams did, indeed, become the fashion, but such gifts cannot be imitated, except by a forced and mechanical performance. There were many pseudo-Senecas, but there was only one original, one master. And then, too, Seneca was a scholar; he knew by close reading the philosophical schools which had come forward, one after the other, in the Hellenic world. He had in his youth sojourned in Egypt, and studied the impressive antiquities of that famous land; he had made the tour of the

Nile to the cataracts. As he, more and more, sought a definite basis and foundation for his life, a pilotage for his soul, in the Stoic system, he filled the niches of that soul with what we may call the great figures of the Stoic saints, among whom stood the great character whom so many schools revered, Socrates of Athens. It is a shallow phrase to call Seneca the fashionable philosopher of his time; few ages were so anti-Stoic as his own. In this deluge of luxury or mean ideals the small number of nobler spirits, Paetus Thrasea, Crenutius Cordus, and, later, Arulenus Rusticus, Arria, Fannia, Helvidius, and many others, have stood forth, but they were an *elite*, deeply at variance with their own world and with the trend of the times, devoted, in that autocracy varnished over with many republican shams preserved out of the past, devoted, I say, to the autonomy of the soul and to a philosophy of freedom.

And a severe test to all these things for the philosophical orator was close at hand. That crisis of life was bound up with the end of Caligula. One might call this emperor an insane monster or what you like, he certainly was beset with a disease which he himself considered a distemper of the brain (Suet., *Cal.*, 50). On January 25, 41, after Rome had endured him less than four years, he fell under the strokes of the conspirators. The world had long expected it, and took it as a matter of course. He was succeeded by his uncle Claudius, a helpless man of middle age. From childhood up he had been awkward, and troubled with many physical ailments. His own delight were books, and he had acquired no mean attainments in history, antiquities, and grammar. His family was sorry for him, and always felt, as it were, obliged to apologize for such a one as one of their own. The empress, at his accession, was Valeria Messalina, whose infamous unchastity has become proverbial. She was his third wife. Having now attained the highest earthly station possible to a woman, she gave full play to her rancor against the emperor's niece, Julia Sivilla, a daughter of the noble Germanicus. That princess was supremely fair, and often alone enjoyed her imperial uncle's

conversation (*Dio Cass.*, 60, 8). Besides this, Julia had not courted or flattered her. So Messalina trumped up a false charge that the princess had maintained adulterous relations with Seneca. She was banished and later slain, and Seneca was relegated to the Island of Corsica, where he lived for seven years. He had been tried in the Senate, the latter acting as a high court of impeachment, and the scholarly emperor's intercession, he himself claimed, had saved his life. This terrible experience, where his substantial innocence seems beyond any doubt, removed the foremost man of letters and the leader of Roman culture to an abode of misery. Later in life he surveyed this period and all the earlier stages of his life in these proud words (*Nat. Quaest.*, IV, 14 sqq.): "I devoted myself to liberal studies. Although poverty urged another course, and my native faculties led me towards a goal where there is an immediate reward of scholarship" (a rhetor's profession at the capital), "I turned aside to poetical authorship" (his tragedies perhaps), "which brought no income, and betook myself to the wholesome study of philosophy. I displayed the truth that high excellence may settle on any soul, and, struggling to rise above the narrow limitations of my birth, measuring myself, not by accidental lot, but by the aspirations of my innermost being, I took my stand, a peer of the greatest. Not even a Caligula wrested from me my loyalty for Gaetulicus, nor Messalina and Narcissus in the case of others, when my affection for them had fatal consequences, — these two, I say, public enemies long before they destroyed themselves, could not swerve me from my purpose. Not a word was forced from me, other than could be uttered by a good conscience. For my friends I feared everything, for myself nothing, except that I might not have been a staunch enough friend. No womanish tears did I shed, no one's hands I wrung as a suppliant. I did nothing unbecoming a virtuous person, unbecoming a man."

So he went into the solitude and into the rude life of his Corsican exile. Here, as always, there were alive within him two voices, that of Stoic firmness and Stoic pride, but not less

so that of yearning after the fame and prosperity which had surrounded him at the capital of the world. Some of his verse of that period is preserved (*Epigrammata super Exilio*):—

Corsica, smaller than Sardinia, longer than Elba,
 Corsica, traversed by streams rich in fish,
 Corsica, awful in the first heat of the summer,
 More cruel when the dog-star displays his cruel face,—
 Spare thou the exiled, that is, spare thou the buried.
 Let thy soil be light to the ashes of the living dead.

His only son, Marcus, was then beginning his course with the rhetor. He died before his father's restoration. Some of Seneca's verse of exile is addressed to his native city of Corduba:—

Corduba, dishevel thy locks, and assume the countenance of
 sorrow,

Send thou funeral gifts, weeping over my ashes.

Now lament, O Corduba, thy distant bard,—

I, once the great citizen, thy glory,

I am pinned to the rock (like Prometheus). Corduba, dishevel
 thy locks,

And congratulate thyself that nature doth lave thee with the
 furthestmost Atlantic.

So much later comes thy grief.

New York, N. Y.

E. G. SIHLER.

(To be continued.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

The Religious Education Association is launching out into a field of church activity which materially affects our interests. . . . I believe that the proceedings of their convention in Chicago will be exceedingly interesting to you, and that, after it is all over, you will be convinced that you did not waste a moment of time, though you may have to repudiate in your mind nearly all of what you heard spoken and saw done.

Prof. Dau to the writer.

"The Religious Education Association is the federation, in a comprehensive organization, without creedal conditions, of those who seek to promote and improve moral and religious education. The membership includes ministers of religion, college presidents and professors, teachers and officers in

public schools and Sunday-schools, students, parents, educational officials, and social workers. Membership offers the advantages of fellowship, conference, cooperative effort, counsel, and aid. . . . The Association's primary purpose is to stimulate, inspire, and assist. It serves as a center for leaders, a forum, a clearing-house, a unifying, coordinating agency. It has about 3,000 members in this and other countries."

This Association came together in Chicago, Ill., on February 28, 1916, and held meetings until the 1st of March, 1916, in the morning, afternoon, and evening of each day. The meetings were all open to the public, though the discussion of the papers was restricted to the members of the Association. A multitude of literature for free distribution was laid out on a table in the office, and the public was invited to help itself. We had expected to see the convention hall filled with an eager and attentive throng of Religious Education Association people, but must record our surprise at the small attendance and comparative lack of attention given to the reading and discussion of the papers by this body.

The program prepared for the convention seemed to be of a harmonious character, keeping for its central object the week-day religious instruction of the child and youth. By various authors, papers had been promised on

A. Primary Considerations on the Relation of Instruction in Religion to Public Education.

1. Some data on the relation of the public school and religious education.
2. Do present plans endanger our religious liberties?
3. Attitude of the Jews toward week-day religious instruction.

B. Practical Problems.

1. Upon what conditions can Churches of different denominations combine in giving week-day instruction?
2. Are the Churches competent for week-day religious instruction?

3. Worship in connection with week-day religious instruction. How is such worship related to religious exercises in the public schools?

4. Religion as an element in the education of an American child.

5. In actual practise, what is the relation of a Gary public school to religion and the Churches?

C. Curricula and Teachers.

1. The problem of curriculum for week-day religious instruction (scope and material):—

- a. From the Roman Catholic view-point;
- b. From the Protestant view-point;
- c. From the Jewish view-point.

2. Teachers for the week-day religious school.

- a. What qualifications should be regarded as standard?
- b. Where is a supply of teachers to be found?
- c. How can training for this work be secured?

D. The Question of Credits. (Given by the State schools. — ED.)

1. What view of the relation of Church and State is involved in the plan for State school credits for instruction in religion?

2. What are the reasons for asking the State to give school credits for religious instruction?

3. Possible problems from the educational point of view.

Many preliminary investigations and studies were cataloged in the program. They cover a wide field: recent experiments in week-day instruction in religion in Gary, New York City, Virginia, Austin (Texas), Chicago, North Dakota High Schools, Colorado High Schools, Lakewood (Ohio); the week-day religious instruction in the Lutheran parochial schools; German Evangelical parochial schools; Roman Catholic parochial schools; the Jewish day-schools; the religious exercises in public schools in Texas, Oklahoma, and Ontario (Canada).

Aside from the meetings of the general body, provisions

were made for meetings of departments. The program showed these papers:—

A. Bible Teachers in Colleges.

1. On the present work of Bible-teaching in colleges.
2. Standardization of the department in colleges.
3. Correlation of the work in colleges and secondary schools.

B. Theological Seminaries, Churches, and Pastors.

The curriculum of the seminary in view of the needs of the modern church:—

1. From the point of view of the pastor;
2. From the point of view of the rural needs.
3. In what way does the modern Church have an educational function?

C. Sunday-schools.

The relation of week-day instruction to the Sunday-school:—

- a. As to curriculum;
- b. As to teachers;
- c. As to the accredited Bible-study plan.

D. Program of Religious Education in a Church.

1. What material will prove most effective in realizing the purpose of religious education?
2. What is the necessary, and what is the desirable equipment for religious education in the church?
3. The correlation of the religious educational work in the church under one committee and of all activities of the young people in one organization, the Sunday-school.

There was also a conference of church-workers in State Universities, with an elaborate program. But we will pass over this. It is needless to say that this lengthy program was not completely carried out. The lack of time and the absence of such as were to read papers prevented it.

No papers read were adopted by the convention. They were only read and then briefly discussed. It is therefore hard

to say whether or not the Association stands for what was read and said. In fact, it was emphatically stated that the convention does not stand sponsor for any opinion voiced in any paper, and that the convention might hold as many opinions as there were members in the Association. Though this is a very unsatisfactory method of procedure according to our mode of thinking and acting, and differs from the custom followed at our conferences and synods, yet it is in keeping with the purpose of this organization. It is a forum, a clearing-house.

As it was a religious congress, religion was the chief topic. Yet it was emphasized that religion in our day could not be of the type of the older theologies, nor of the differing and opposing Churches, nor that taught in theological seminaries. But religion is a necessity, something indispensable. It was made a part of the common law of England, and was taken over into our common law. It is a fundamental of our civilization. It is something that must be taught. People must have, ought to have, a religion. In showing the importance of religion, Jew, Protestant, and Catholic joined. But one thing nobody said, and that was, — what religion really is.

As a means of producing and promoting religion, the Bible was urged, though it was by no means thought to be the only source of religious knowledge and influence. It was not spoken of as the written revelation of God's eternal wisdom. But it was admitted that it is an important book for religious instruction. Yet fables and moral tales might also do. The great question before the convention was how to create more interest in Bible-study, how to introduce it into the schools of the State, and how to make it better studied in church-schools and Sunday-schools. The convention seemed to feel the insufficiency of the customary Sunday-school training, and wished to substitute something better. For this reason credits were asked for it in State-schools, and the Gary Plan, North Dakota Plan, and Colorado Plan evolved. Bible-study was further urged as a part of a liberal education, and one speaker pointed out that

a course of Bible-study might be the equal of a course in English, and even better. Still some lifted up their voices also in protest against bringing the Bible into the scheme of public education. Many dangers were pointed out. It was said that the State could no more teach Christianity than it could teach Judaism or any other form of religion. It would lead to a mingling of Church and State, and offend against the basic principle of our United States Constitution—religious liberty. If the Churches should furnish the religious instruction in the public schools, then the State ought rightfully to reimburse them for services rendered. Then would follow State-control of religious instruction, and the right to worship according to the dictates of conscience would be lost. It would be a pity to yoke religious education to State education, and would seem to indicate that religion were so weak that it could not well exist alone, and must be propped up by State influence and authority. According to its principle, the convention took no stand on this question, but the writer feels that the opinion of the majority thought it good and fine to inflict religion and the Bible upon the State.

The Church was not once mentioned as the communion of saints. Its importance in the community and its influence were admitted. It was hoped, however, that the old Church, which followed theologies, might soon pass away, and that in its place would come the modern Church, which had religion, but no theology.

This word was used only with apologies. The speakers seemed to detest it. They blamed it for the division of Christianity, the failure of the Churches, and the lack of religion.

The Catholic view of religious education was given in a masterly manner by a priest of this Church. A paper on the Lutheran schools had been compiled by a Methodist professor from material sent him by Norwegian Lutherans. It was a pity that this paper could not be presented by a Missouri Lutheran. The Jewish view was also presented. They have their own problems and difficulties. But they want their

children taught in their sacred books. It is especially the poor class that seeks this instruction. They want to pay for their education, and fear the influence of philanthropy and charity on education. They think what is worth having at all is worth paying for. They insist on religious instruction in their mother-tongue.

The convention plainly showed what religion must come to when Churches leave divine revelation, and enter the field of speculation. It brings them into utter confusion.

It is true, we do not regret the time we spent at this meeting, but must repudiate nearly all we heard. However, we all thank God most fervently that He has kept us from doubt and confusion, and taught us to acknowledge: *Quod non est biblicum, non est theologicum.*

Chicago, Ill.

ARTHUR H. C. BOTH.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE THIRD ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

Matt. 7, 13: *Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction; and many there be which go in thereat.*

We find this exhortation towards the close of the Sermon on the Mount. In striking imagery the Lord pictures man's journey into eternity. There are two roads. Many walk on the "broad way," few on the "narrow way"; the former leads to "destruction," the latter to "life." At the beginning of the narrow way is the "*strait*," i. e., narrow, gate. This "strait gate" is conversion by means of contrition and repentance. By regeneration, conversion, one enters on the "narrow way,"

a way full of self-denial, beset by temptations to sin, etc., a way that requires wary walking. The meaning, of course, is not that we Christians merit eternal life by the careful walk on the narrow way. No. Faith alone saves; but faith manifests itself in a Christian walk, in good works. Faith without works is dead. The "wide gate" and the "broad way" are the image of an unbridled life, a life of sin. By nature man is on the broad way, and—if no change of heart occurs—his end is "destruction."—The passage speaks of but *two* gates, of *two* ways, of *two* destinations, of *two* classes of people. There is *no third* way, a way leading to an intermediate state between heaven and hell, leading, *e. g.*, to Hades, to a *Mittel-ort zur Selbstentscheidung*, or to purgatory.

OF ETERNAL LIFE.

Luke 23, 43: *Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise.*

"Lord, remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom." Who knows them not, these words of the repentant malefactor!—"This was a case of repentance in the last hour, the trying hour of death; and it has been remarked that *one* was brought to repentance there, to show that no one should *despair* on a dying bed; and *but one*, that none should be presumptuous and *delay* repentance to that awful moment." (*Barnes.*) The criminal dying on the cross recognized the crucified Savior as the "*Lord,*" *i. e.*, God, Jehovah. This bleeding, dying Jesus, moreover, he knew to be a king, who rules over a kingdom,—not, indeed, a kingdom of this world (John 18, 36), but a heavenly, supernatural kingdom. This prayer of faith the Lord answers immediately, saying, "*Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise.*" Christ's kingdom is Paradise. "*Paradise,*" we are told, is a word of Persian origin, signifying a magnificent garden, a garden of pleasure. Whatever its etymological meaning may be, in its New Testament usage it is a synonym for heaven, connoting heavenly bliss and glory; it is the abode of the

blessed. (2 Cor. 12, 4; 1 Cor. 2, 9; Rev. 2, 9.) Into this heavenly glory I shall enter, says Christ to this criminal, and thou shalt be with Me. — When was that happy event to take place? “*To-day.*” Whilst his body would still be on the cross or consigned to the grave, his *soul* would be with Jesus, would exist separately from the body. This is the plain meaning of the text, and the truth to be pointed out in reference to the thesis in the Catechism, which says: “All believers, when they die, are, according to the *soul*, *at once present with Christ.*”

But, sad to say, even this plain passage has been tortured, *e. g.*, by the Adventists, who deny the immortality of the soul. To cloak their antisciptural doctrine, they punctuate Christ’s answer thus: “Verily, I say unto thee to-day, Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise.” How absurd this procedure is becomes apparent at once when we observe the idea contrasted. The dying thief had said, “Remember me when Thou comest into Thy kingdom,” the petition implying that he thought of some *future* time when the Lord should remember him. Emphatically Jesus places the word *to-day* in opposition to this erroneous notion, saying, *To-day*, — not in the distant future, — but *to-day*, this very day, thou shalt be with Me. — Again, looked at from another view-point, how utterly nonsensical the sense: “I say unto thee to-day, Thou shalt,” etc.! The culprit well knew that Jesus did not speak these words yesterday or to-morrow! But observe the audacity of the tactics of the errorists: contrary to text and context, contrary to even the elementary rules of exegesis, they boldly put their gross perversions in cold print, relying on the old dictum: *Semper aliquid haeret.*

And now as to the Catholics. If any one needed a cleansing according to papal doctrine, surely this thief stood in need of it. Jesus says nothing of a purgatory. The pope and Scriptures never agree.

Finally, we must pay our respects to the modern theologians. We ask, Where is their Sheol or Hades in the light of this passage? As is well known, they have gone the Catho-

lies one better. The Catholics dream of three places in the hereafter: heaven, hell, and purgatory; the modern theologians, of four: heaven, hell, and Hades with two apartments — Paradise and a place of preliminary torture. Now, where did the repentant criminal go? To this third place, Apartment I of modern theological construction? No. He was *with Jesus*: “Thou shalt be *with Me* in Paradise.” Not even modern theologians have the temerity to assert that Jesus was in their self-constructed Hades. This miracle of God’s grace, the repentant thief, was *with Jesus*. To be *with Jesus* is the chief glory of eternal life. St. Paul, filled with longing for this blessed state, declares: “I desire to depart and *to be with Christ*.” (Phil. 1, 23; cf. Rev. 21, 23.) This was the bliss granted this penitent criminal: “Thou shalt be *with Me*.”

Rev. 14, 13: *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth.*

According to the text in its context, to “*die in the Lord*” means to die professing the Lord, to die because one is a Christian, to die for faith’s sake. Such, *e. g.*, was the death of the martyrs. Deny the Lord, they were told, and you live; confess Him, and you die. They preferred death to denial; they “died in the Lord” to live with Him eternally. “To die in the Lord,” therefore, in general means to believe steadfastly in Him despite all trials and tribulations of this present time, till death calls us hence. — Now, what is predicated of such as “die in the Lord”? They are *blessed*, *i. e.*, eternal bliss is theirs. (Cf. Matt. 5, 8 ff.) They are *in* the Lord, closely united to Him by faith, and death does not and cannot sever this union, but, dying “*in* the Lord,” they are forever with Him — *blessed*. — When does this glorious state begin? “*From henceforth*,” ἀπ᾿αὐτῆς, *forthwith*, from the moment the soul departs from the body.

Again we call attention to the fact that this passage, too, deals a death-blow both to the purgatory of the Catholics and the Hades of the modern theologians. They that “die in the Lord” are blessed *forthwith*; they need no purgatory-cleansing;

they have been cleansed from all sin by the blood of Jesus Christ. (1 John 1, 7.)

John 10, 27. 28: *My sheep hear My voice, and I know them, and they follow Me: and I give unto them eternal life.*

A gracious promise, indeed, it is the Lord Jesus here makes to them that are His. — It was at the Feast of Dedication that His opponents, the Jews, who reproached Him for holding them in suspense as to whether He were the promised Messiah, were flatly told by Jesus: “Ye are not of My sheep.” (v. 26.) He goes on to describe His sheep, showing that they have certain characteristics. — We ask, Who are His sheep? “My sheep.” τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ = *the sheep that belong to Me*, says Jesus, have this mark, — they “hear My voice,” that is to say, they hear My voice not externally only, as you, My enemies, do, but they hear it *believingly*, *trustingly* (ἀκούειν c. Gen.). They know My voice to be the voice of the Good Shepherd, whose leadership they can implicitly follow. This they do: “*They follow Me*,” — that is another mark of “*the sheep that belong to Me*.” They are absolutely assured of the fact that I will lead them to green pastures and beside the still waters. — The Good Shepherd’s voice is heard to-day. He assures us: Who heareth you heareth Me.” The Gospel is Christ’s voice. His sheep, the Christians, hear and read this Gospel. In it Christ speaks to them, exhorts them. They know it to be His voice and put their hearts’ confidence in it. Gladly, too, they follow Him whither He leads them. They know Him. — “*And I know them*,” Christ says. “*I know them*,” γινώσκω, says more than, I know of them, I have a knowledge of them, I know who they are, and how many there are of them, I know all their trials, difficulties, etc. All this is true. But this saying, “*I know them*,” goes deeper; it means, I know them *with love and affection*, I know them *as My own*. And to all these He makes this promise: “*I give unto them eternal life*.” “*I give*” is present tense; eternal life is theirs now already. Man, by nature, is spiritually dead. Unbelievers are walking and breathing corpses. Life, true life, they have not. The

sheep of Christ, the Christians, of whom Jesus speaks, have life through Him who is Life. He knew them, foreknew them, and this is the reason why they possess life. It was a gift of His. This true life manifests itself: they "hear His voice" believingly; they "follow Him" trustingly. This is proof positive that they possess life, true life. Believers, "born of God" (John 1, 13), possess true life now in time, life of God, life in God, life with God. Temporal death does not destroy this life, but, on the contrary, brings about a full, perfect fruition of this life with God, with Christ, never to cease—*eternal* life. And all sheep that are His receive this gift; not one shall be lost; no one shall be plucked out of His hand. Said Jesus to Martha: "He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." (John 11, 25, 26.)

1 John 3, 2: *Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.*

There is a peculiar emphasis upon the word "are" in this text: "Now *are* we the sons of God." The reason thereof becomes evident from the preceding verse. There the statement is made: "We are the sons of God," and the thought is added that to the eyes of the world this great blessedness is not apparent. "The world knoweth us not"; the world looks upon us Christians as being of all men most miserable, and the faith that we profess of being God's own it sneers at as a delusion. But what of it? The *fact* remains: "Now *are* we the sons of God." Our sonship is a reality; great is our present blessed condition, but far greater things are in store for us. This sonship, hidden now, will one day be revealed. "*It is not yet manifest what we shall be.*" What great blessedness awaits us even we Christians cannot apprehend. But some things we do know because revealed in Scriptures, and among these is: "*We know that we shall be like Him.*" We know,—it is not fiction, fancy of the mind; *we know*,—here is absolute

knowledge. What do we know? One day "*He, Christ, shall appear*" in great glory with all His holy angels and with the trump of God. (1 Thess. 4, 16.) Then all that are in the graves shall come forth; we Christians, the sons of God, will meet the Lord in the air. In the twinkling of an eye we shall be changed. (1 Cor. 15, 51.) Our bodies will be like unto Christ's glorious body. (Phil. 3, 21.) *We know we shall be like Him.* The image of God, lost through the Fall, and renewed according to the beginning in this life, in yonder life will be fully restored. (Ps. 17, 15.) *We shall be like, ὅμοιοι, Him.* We do not become gods; we remain "children of God," but children, sons, of God, glorified. *This we know* to be true. Why? "*For*"—reason why we know it to be so—"we shall see Him as He is." With the eyes of our glorified body we shall see Him, Jesus, Lord, Jehovah, "*as He is*"; we shall see Him as to His essence and as to His properties. All the glory of yonder life St. John compresses into this one clause: "*We shall see Him as He is.*" We shall know and see, *e. g.*, the mystery of the Trinity in unity, the mystery of the incarnation of Christ, *et al.* How do we know? "*For we shall see Him as He is.*" And His ways, so often past finding out here below, will be manifest to us. Here the questions often occur to us: Why must I go through this suffering? Why did this calamity befall me? But there is no answer. Then, however, we shall know and see, what we here believed, "that all things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. 8, 28); "*for we shall see Him as He is.*" "Now," says the apostle 1 Cor. 13, "we see through a glass, darkly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then I shall know according as also I am known." In yonder life soul and body will be reunited and live with Christ in eternal joy and glory. And this beatific seeing of Him "*as He is*" will be the acme of heavenly bliss.

Ps. 16, 11: *In Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures forevermore.*

Ps. 16 is a Messianic psalm. (Cf. Acts 2, 25—28; 13, 35—37.) The words of v. 11 are words of the suffering Savior.

And the believers in Christ repeat these words after Him, and console themselves therewith. Language is inadequate to express the blessedness awaiting us in yonder life. "*Fulness of joy*," "*pleasures forevermore*," — such and similar expressions, indicating the abundant quantity and the endless duration of the joys of heaven, must suffice us here below. And when we consider that these joys and pleasures are in God's "*presence*," "*at His right hand*," we know that the splendor and glory awaiting us will far surpass all our fondest anticipations, and we confidently say with the Psalmist: "I shall be satisfied when I awake with Thy likeness." (Ps. 17, 15.)

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(*To be continued.*)

LEAVEN AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The question, "Grape-juice or wine in the Lord's Supper?" has been discussed in the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY (Vol. XVII, July, 1913) with sufficient comprehensiveness and thoroughness for all practical purposes, both from the historical and exegetical view-point. There is one argument, however, which has been advanced by the opponents that has sometimes perplexed the defenders of the Eucharist. The National W. C. T. U., at the Omaha convention, 1909, passed the resolution: "We deplore the use of alcoholic wine in the Church of God as representing the blood of Christ. Science tells us that alcohol is the product of decay, and we know it to be the cause of crime and misery, and we protest against its use in the sacred ordinance." In the accompanying letter we read as follows: "Alcohol is known to be the deadly enemy of the cause of Christ. When He established the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, He gave His followers the 'fruit of the vine.' In no instance is it recorded that He used the word wine, and it was during Passover week, when ferment was not found in the house of a Jew (under a penalty), and we can use the

'fruit of the vine' as God gives it to us, and not after (as science teaches us) the process of decay has converted it into the poisonous alcoholic wine of commerce. Also in using the 'fruit of the vine' pure and sweet, we have a correct emblem of His shed blood, but in no sense can a decayed, destructive substance such as alcohol represent Christ, His blood, or His mission, neither are we scientifically correct in calling alcohol the 'fruit of the vine.'"

In this presentation there is one assertion that concerns us here, namely this, that *at the Passover feast of the Old Testament, and therefore at the institution of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament, fermented wine could not have been used*, and that all Christians should therefore discontinue the use of wine when celebrating Holy Communion. The principal texts which the writers of the above communication apparently had in mind are Ex. 12, 15. 19 and 13, 7, as well as the corresponding passages in Deuteronomy. In the former passage (Ex. 12, 19) we read: "Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that soul shall be cut off"; and in the latter (Ex. 13, 7): "Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days, and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters." The question is: What does the word "leaven" mean here, and does this command touch drinking as well as eating? In the Hebrew we have here the word *seor*, of which there can be no doubt that it means only the "leaven, yeast, or ferment" used in making leavened bread. This is evident from Ex. 12, 15: "Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread (*mazah*); even the first day ye shall put away leaven (*seor*) out of your houses; for whosoever eateth leavened bread," etc. Lev. 2, 11: "Ye shall burn no leaven (*seor*) in any offering of the Lord made by fire"; cf. v. 7: "And if thy oblation be a meat-offering, it shall be made of fine flour with oil." Deut. 16, 4: "And there shall be no leavened bread (*seor*) seen with thee in all thy coast." That *seor* always means "leaven, yeast, or ferment"

used in making bread, we see also from the New Testament passages, in which the Greek word *zyme*, the translation of *seor* in the Old Testament, is used: Matt. 16, 12 (leaven of bread); Matt. 13, 33 and Luke 13, 21 (leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened): 1 Cor. 5, 6 and Gal. 5, 9 (a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump). The other Hebrew words which concern us here are *chamez* and *mazah*, from the verb *chamaz*. The word *chamez* is used parallel to, and indiscriminately with, *seor*, and therefore also means "leaven or ferment" used in making bread, and, figuratively, the leavened bread itself. Lev. 2, 11: "No meat-offering shall be made with leaven (*chamez*)"; Deut. 16, 3: "Thou shalt eat no leavened bread (*chamez*) with it." (Amos 4, 5.) The word *mazah* means unleavened bread. It is the *terminus* for the bread of Passover: Deut. 16, 3 (unleavened bread, *mazot lechem*); 1 Sam. 28, 24, Gen. 19, 3, Ex. 23, 15 (unleavened bread); Ex. 34, 18, Lev. 2, 5 (flour unleavened): Lev. 8, 26 (unleavened bread, unleavened cake); Num. 28, 17 (unleavened bread).

There remains but one more word, the word *machmezet*, a form of the verb *chamaz*. That this also, however, refers to *solid* food which might be made or become sour, we see from the very words of the text: "Whosoever eateth that which is leavened." (Ex. 12, 19 b.) The same word refers to bread, to solid food, Hos. 7, 4: "until it be leavened." We, therefore, say in regard to the command of God about leaven and leavened bread: "Non solum panis fermentatus, sed etiam alius cibus acidus aut acescens" (*Goodwin*), Not only leavened bread, but also other food which was sour or becoming sour, was prohibited by God. But that the command of God also referred to wine (*yayin*) or other intoxicating liquors (*shekar*) after fermentation cannot be proved from any text. Where the word *chomez* is used, it always refers to vinegar (Num. 6, 3; Ps. 69, 22; Prov. 10, 26; 25, 20). Wine and strong drink, far from being regarded as impure by the Jews, was, on the contrary, used in certain sacrifices. We read Num. 28, 7: "In

the Holy Place shalt thou cause the strong drink (*shekar*) to be poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering." Ex. 29, 40 (wine for a drink-offering); Hos. 9, 4 (wine-offerings to the Lord). (See Baehr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Kultus*, II, p. 303.)

But that is not all. The liquors that were barred during Passover week according to Jewish law are enumerated in the *Mishna*: "The law [prohibiting leaven to be seen or found in the house on Passover] is transgressed by the following articles: Babylonian kuthach [a mixture of moldy bread with milk and salt, used as a sauce for food], Median beer [made of wheat or barley], Edomite vinegar [made by the fermentation of barley and wine], Egyptian zeethum [a mixture of barley, salt, and wild saffron], the dough of bran used by dyers, the dough used by cooks [to attract the impurities in a pot where food was boiling], and the paste used by scribes [to paste the sheets of paper together]." And far from finding a passage prohibiting the use of wine at the Passover meal, we are told that all partakers were obliged to drink four cups of wine during the meal, the last of which was drunk in the intervals of the second part of the Hallel. (Rodkinson's *Babylonian Talmud*, Tract Pesachim, V, 210.) "Each cup must contain wine, which, when mixed with three parts of water, will be good wine. . . . The cup must contain the taste and the color of red wine. . . . Because it is written (Prov. 23, 31): 'Do not look on the wine when it is red,'—whence we adduce that wine must be red." (*L. c.*, pp. 68, 226.) There can, therefore, not be the slightest doubt, on *historical* grounds, that our Lord, in instituting the Eucharist, used wine, true, fermented, intoxicating wine, though it may have been diluted, after the Jewish custom, and known as *krama*.

But there is also sound *exegetical* basis for the use of wine, even in the words of institution, Matt. 26, 27—29, Mark 14, 23—25, Luke 22, 18—20. The *genema tes ampelou* was not a term used by Christ to permit the greatest latitude, but it is the *terminus* of the Jews for the *Passover wine*. Their blessing of wine which they used upon all occasions, but es-

pecially at the Passover, was: "Benedictus sit, qui creavit fructum vitis", Blessed be He who created the fruit of the vine! (*L. c.*, pp. 215. 221, and elsewhere.) Whenever the expression "fruit of the vine" was used, it *always* meant *wine*, fermented, intoxicating wine, and nothing else.

The only conclusion we can reach, then, is this: The essential elements in the Lord's Supper are bread and wine, fermented, intoxicating wine. Without wine, there is no Lord's Supper. About the *accidens* or *adiaphoron*, as to whether this wine be red or white, pure or mixed with water, and whether the bread should be made of wheat, rye, or barley flour, leavened or unleavened, there may be different opinions, since here historical, and not exegetical, reasons only come into consideration.

St. Paul, Minn.

PAUL E. KRETZMANN.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE ANCIENT WALDENSIAN (WALLENSIAN) CHURCH.

An excerpt from six (English, French, and Dutch) works of Waldensian authors, at the Public Library of Chicago, composed by *Rev. Franz Ludw. Braun*, late French Vaudois Lutheran mission pastor at Chicago.

The Gospel was brought into the glens of the Cottian Alps of Northern Italy by the disciples of the apostles on their journeys by land from Rome to Gaul (France) and Spain. The glen-dwellers gladly received it, and kept it pure and undefiled in a good heart. Their simple church-service consisted of singing psalms and preaching. They belonged to the bishopric of Turin. With the sanction of the bishop they elected their own preachers, who were married, choosing members of their own clan.

As the mountainous country could not support all the descendants of the glen-dwellers (hunters and herders), a number of them had to emigrate. Some settled in the valleys of the Po and Adige and their affluents in Northern Italy; others preferred the hilly country of the Provence in Southern France,

especially the county of Albige, whose capital is Albi. The thrift of the latter turned their section of the country into a garden-spot, unexcelled by any other section of France, and also into a seat of learning, which is clearly proved by the relics of works in the Provençal language.

Traveling Christian merchants from the far East visited these settlements, and were in the habit of resting there awhile from the hardships of travel. The simple forms of the church-service and the simple mode of life of the glen-dwellers and their descendants called forth their admiration, and they called them *καθαροί*, Cathares, or Puritans. Whether they brought manuscripts of parts of the Bible to these people has not been proved, but it is probable. Their conversation, together with what they told them of the teaching and customs prevalent in the Christian Church in the East, at any rate produced a higher state of Biblical and Church learning among those simple folk than it was found anywhere else. What may be stated as a fact, however, is that they enlightened the Cathares on the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the saints, and with regard to their pictures. There is no proof, as claimed by Catholic writers, that those travelers imported such false doctrines as were condemned by the ecumenical councils of the first four centuries of the Christian era, for example, Manichæism. Nevertheless, quite in accordance with the old adage that if you keep on lying, some of it, at least, will finally be believed, credit was given to those Catholic scribes in spite of the orthodox confessions of the Cathares, and the church council held at Lombers, near Albi, Provence, in 1167, condemned them. (Cf. Geo. Faber, *History and Theology of the Ancient Waldenses*. London, 1838.)

Though in the course of centuries there became apparent a slight disparity of cult as observed by the glen-dwellers, whose cult was very simple, and the Cathares, there was still a great difference between their evangelical cult, or church-service, and that of the Roman Catholics. Some bishops did not consider such a disparity of cults as being essential, while others in-

sisted that the Cathares should conform their simple form of worship to that of the papal Church, external conformity and internal dissension,—and still others wanted to deprive the Cathares of their old-time privilege of electing their own preachers, and of choosing them out of their own clans. In one section of the country the Cathares opposed their bishop in regard to this, in another section with respect to another hierarchical misuse of the Christian doctrine. There always was a doctrinal strife regarding Christian doctrine and practise. It was still in the days before Hildebrand became Pope Gregory VII (1015—1085) and the arch-architect of the papal hierarchy that the Catholic clergy nicknamed these people Cathares (Puritans), but perverting the meaning of the word by causing it to signify spiritually impure, unclean, teachers and believers of false doctrines. In this latter sense the German word *Ketzer* (derived from Cathares) is still in use.

The Catholic clergy called the original glen-dwellers (in German: *Klammleute*, *Klammler*, *Engtaeler*), in the Cottian Alps, Wallenses or Waldenses, from the Provençal *valde*—*valdes*, meaning narrow valley, glen (French, *vallée*, *val*, *vau*—*Vaudois*). In the course of time this nickname, like the nickname Lutherans given by the Catholic clergy to the followers of Luther, became an honored name, especially after the blood of Waldensian martyrs had been spilled. During the reign of Pope Gregory VII the doctrinal strife became more intense, and his papal decree of celibacy was strenuously opposed by the Waldenses, finally resulting in a secession of the Waldensian from the Roman Catholic Church and in the excommunication of the former by the pope.

The original glen-dwellers, as well as their descendants, the Cathares of Northern Italy and Southern France, never believed in doing mission-work or making proselytes. This is the main difference between them and the "Beggars," the followers of Peter Waldus, of Lyons, who were called Waldensians. They were excommunicated as heretics by the Catholic Church in 1185.

PETER WALDUS.

About in the middle of the twelfth century there lived in Lyons, France, a rich merchant, who had many traveling agents, and who was also an alderman, or member of the city council. His name was Peter. For business reasons, and imitating the custom of the learned profession, he adopted a surname, or family name, and called himself Waldus after the place of his birth and childhood (French, Vaudois), as he was a glen-dweller's son, born at Vaudra (Glenville; German, Klammweiler). When, one day, at the meeting of the City Council, a member suddenly died, having received an apoplectic stroke, the case made a deep impression upon Peter Waldus; he bethought himself of his soul's welfare with great seriousness. In order that he might be properly prepared if death should take him unawares, he hit upon a scheme which, as he had been taught in the Catholic Church, would assure him eternal salvation, but which had hitherto been unheard of. He parted with all his riches in this way: One third of his entire possessions he gave to his wife to support his family, another third to the poor, and the last third he spent to pay for the translation of the Latin New Testament into the Provençal vernacular. He himself took the vow of poverty and made all his agents do the same thing, in consequence of which they were called "Poor Men," "Beggars." This act called forth the admiration of the people, and the poor sent up many supplications to God to bless their benefactor. He was, of course, in great favor with the Church; the doors of the monasteries were opened to his agents, the "Beggars," to give them shelter. His favorite notion was to reestablish in the Church the mode of living of the first century of the Christian era. This, too, was praised as a good work. Twice he asked the pope to permit his agents to preach (lay-preaching), that they might propagate his views among the people. His agents had written to him of the simple life of the Wallensians and the Cathares. Then he conceived the idea of forming a union with those simple Christians, already separated and

banned by the Catholic clergy, and thus reestablishing the mode of life of the Christians of the first century. He applied for a colloquium, or disputation, with the Wallensians and Cathares. It took place, and both parties agreed in all doctrines (Peter Waldus, very likely, yielded in the hope of final success) except in that regarding the Sacrament. Peter professed: "Sacramentum fit per sacerdotis sanctitatem"; the Cathares, on the other hand: "Sacramentum fit per jussum Dei et per Verbum divinum." The Catholic historian who gives an account of that colloquium refrains from commenting on it in the least.

The colloquium plainly showed how firmly Peter Waldus still clung to the false doctrines of the Catholic Church, and that the original Waldenses still had the Biblical conception of a Sacrament. Believing, nevertheless, that a union with the Wallensians had been effected, Peter may have ordered his agents (after 1170) to name their converts Waldenses, or Vaudois, thus giving his followers his own name. Thus it happened that in some Alpine valleys two distinct Waldensian congregations existed independently of one another, one formed by the original glen-dwellers, the other by the followers of Peter Waldus. At the time of the Reformation they finally merged, — not before, as claimed by Catholic authors.

The French Vaudois of the Alpine valleys insist that they are descendants of the glen-dwellers, Wallensians, and not of the followers of Peter Waldus, who, in France, were called Vaudois.

The inhabitants of the Swiss Canton Wallis (French, Vaud), mostly descendants of the Vaudois, expelled from France after the recall of the Edict of Nantes, 1689, call themselves Walliser, Wallenser, Vaudois; their forefathers had chosen the name Wallis, Vaud, when their part of the Canton Bern was formed into a distinct canton.

In three valleys of the Cottian Alps in Northern Italy, close to the state line of France, French has been both the mother-tongue, and the language used in the churches, for more

than two hundred years. Whether they are descendants of emigrants of France, led by General Arnauld after the recall of the Edict of Nantes, 1689, or of the original glen-dwellers, has not been proved beyond a doubt. Strange it is that in the Waldensian settlement in the Black Forest, Germany, where General Arnauld is buried, the same names are found as in the French settlements in the Cottian Alps; *e. g.*, Favre = Taber; Chuet = Glueth; Byros = Beirat; Grillé, Grilli, Griglio = Grille; Carpentier = Zimmermann; Bosio, Bossué = Busse; Combe, Comba = Combe.

The public Confessions of the ancient Wallenses are: 1) Confession at Lomers, 1165; 2) Treatise on Antichrist, 1120; 3) Noble Lesson, 1100; 4) Confession to the French King, 1536. They are found in an English translation in Geo. Faber's *History and Theology of Ancient Wallenses* (London, 1838).

MATERIALS FOR THE CATECHIST.

FIFTH OUTLINE.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT. Qu. 17—28.

"As the First Commandment has instructed the heart and taught it faith, so this commandment leads us forth and directs the mouth and tongue to God. For the first objects that, springing from the heart, manifest themselves are words." *Large Cat.*, p. 397. "The Second Commandment teaches man how to conduct himself toward God in public, in his conversation with others, or in private, in his thoughts of God, *viz.*, how to show reverence to God's name. For we cannot exhibit God to ourselves nor to others according to His divine essence, but only by means of His name." X, 151. Thus Luther seeks to establish the progression of thought from the First to the Second Commandment: from the consideration of God Himself, the highest good, we proceed to the consideration of forms for addressing Him, for regulating our intercourse with, or our references to, Him.

I. The Name of God. Qu. 20.

A. *Names are markers.* When applied to persons, they serve to distinguish a person from others. By pronouncing a person's name, we summon him before our mind and the mind of others. The name stands for the person. We cannot think or speak definitely of anybody except by means of his name.

Names may be inadequate: they may not express all that a person is, all that might be said about him. Names may be arbitrary: they may not state anything characteristic; they may be a mere convenience. Names may even contain contradictions. Mr. White may be a negro. Most names do not exhaust the subject to which they are applied. We are usually able to distinguish between a person and his name. But we are conscious in every case where we repeat the name of a person of a certain fixed and indestructible connection between a name and the person bearing that name.

B. *God also is named.* Moses felt that, in order to speak intelligently of God, he must know His name. He asked God His name, Ex. 3, 13 f.; 6, 3. Nobody has a right to name God. Nobody could truly name Him; for nobody has seen and known Him, so as to understand Him. God's name must come from God Himself. What He calls Himself, that is a true name by which we may call Him.

He has told us that His name is "I Am." God cannot be named by comparison with anybody else. There is no one like Him. *His name is Himself.* He is the great I Am. What we know of Him we know by His telling us. He is called good, wise, holy, mighty. He has derived names for Himself by certain works which He has done, and which can be studied. He is the Creator, the Savior, the Comforter. He has published His Word, the Holy Bible. He has set up ordinances, like Baptism and the Lord's Supper, that are administered in His name. He has put His name upon the society of men which believe in Him, the Church. By all these means God has revealed Himself to men. And this revelation serves us for naming Him. The name of God is "God as He has revealed Himself to us." Ps. 48, 10 declares the praise of God to be coextensive with His name. Everywhere in the world people say something of God that redounds to His honor, *e. g.*, that He dispenses justice, that He rules men with equity. The whole psalm is full of episodes of the divine activity by which now this, now that trait has been displayed. Men tell each other what they know of God. By so doing, they publish and glorify the name of God.

II. The Prohibition. Qu. 21—27.

A. Stated in general terms: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord, thy God, in vain."

1. As in the preceding commandment, God also in this commandment personally turns to every individual. ("Thou.") What He says in this commandment is indeed addressed to the whole human race; but God has adopted a form of speaking that makes Him address only one person. He means you, and you, and you.

2. The name of God may be used "in vain."¹⁾ Since the name of God is God Himself, it should be uttered with reverence. The person who repeats the sacred name without being conscious of its solemnity, who lightly bandies God, Bible, holy things, about on the lips, interlards a common conversation with them, never really intends to be understood as sustaining a worshiper's relation to God, is certainly taking the name of God in vain. This thoughtless, aimless, profitless employment of the holiest things that can enter into our thoughts and rise to our lips, is what the Second Commandment attacks. It reveals the irreverence that is in the human heart, the proneness to profane the Holy One and His holy associations. From irreverence spring all the particular acts which Luther specifies in the Explanation, like so many weeds growing in a common soil. God wants men to be conscious of what they are doing, and why they are doing it, when they utter His name or speak of anything with which He is connected. "We call anything 'vain' and 'useless' that is done without a compelling cause and for a respectable reason." "Would you not consider him a madman who goes to a dance, theater, or to war in sacred vestments appointed to be used at worship? Would not

1) It may be questioned whether in Ex. 20, 7, **שְׁמִי** is derived from the root that signifies "to lift up," *e. g.*, the voice in speaking, the hands in gestures of solemn affirmation, or from the other (identical) root, which means "to take away," "to put out of the way." Again, whether **רָעָה** is to be understood in the general sense of "evil," "iniquity," "wickedness," or in the special sense of "falsehood," "lie." Gesenius renders **לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת־שֵׁם יְהוָה לְשׁוֹן**: "Thou shalt not utter the name of God unto a falsehood, thou shalt not swear falsely." This is Luther's view also; see *Large Cat.*, §§ 51. 52, p. 397. ("Let this be considered the plain and most simple meaning of this commandment.") Thus understood, the commandment has at once a special meaning: it prohibits perjury. But while admitting that this is the *scopus specialissimus* of the text, the terms used admit a much wider scope, which Luther has also adopted in both Catechisms.

such a person turn serious matters into a jest? Now, if you severely reprove such a person, why do you not much more reprove him who misuses that which is holier than any vestment, yea, which renders vestments and anything else sacred?" "We are now become such fine Christians as to buy wooden shoes, to keep us from soiling our new shoes, and we are certainly careful not to trail good dresses through the mire, nor do we vitiate a golden vessel by using it as a urinal; we would not even put swill-water into it. But we shamelessly drag the holy name of God into any indecency." III, 1194 f.

B. Applied to particular acts: "cursing, swearing, using witchcraft, lying and deceiving by His name."

1. *Cursing* ²⁾ by God's name may be viewed

a. As it affects God. Evidently our Catechism means to make "blaspheming God" one form of cursing. "Cursing God" and "blaspheming the name of the Lord" are equivalent expressions in Lev. 24, 15. 16.³⁾ In a wild passion men may hurl words of defiance against God, shake their fist against heaven, utter threats against God. Or they may "mock God." ⁴⁾ They may ridicule the ordinances of God,

2) In our English term "curse" (from the Anglo-Saxon "cursian," which connects with the Danish "korse") lies concealed the precious term "cross." "Korse" means "to make the sign of the cross." Uttering an imprecation and accompanying the utterance with the sign that commemorates our redemption, hence, employing a most holy symbol as a cloak for a most unholy passion, that is what cursing meant originally.

3) Some have assumed that the Egyptian half-breed committed two distinct sins: 1) he cursed "his" god, *i. e.*, some idol to which he had been attached in his native country; 2) he blasphemed the name of the Lord, *i. e.*, the true God of Israel. For each sin a particular punishment was assessed upon him, the former being stated thus: "He shall bear his sin"; the latter, thus: "He shall surely be put to death." But the view is not practical. It is not easy to understand why in the camp of Israel the right of a person to have two gods, one his private idol, the other the national Deity, should be formally recognized in a legal ruling. The natural view is to understand לָקַח, "to make light of," "to treat with contempt," and שָׁם לְקַח, "to pierce through," "to perforate the name," as referring to the identical action. Blaspheming, from the Greek βλάπτω, "to hurt," and φημί, "to speak," almost reproduces the image that lies concealed in the second Hebrew phrase. The blasphemer thrusts his mad execrations like a dagger through God, His name, and His ordinances; he means to hurt God by his speech. There have been instances recorded of such a mad folly.

4) Μυκτηρίζειν, in Gal. 6, 7, means "to writhe the nostrils, as in scorn, to sneer at Him." It refers, in this text, to the contempt shown

make Bible-texts and Bible characters the subject of jests, etc. "How much popularity, do you think, would a person acquire by dumping his prince's escutcheon into the mud and dragging it through mire, while the prince is looking on and telling him not to do so, yea, directing him to set it up in an honorable place? We hear about the Turks profaning our churches, making our altars and sanctuaries filthy, and we become so enraged that we think of ways and means to avenge the crime: we plot war and complain that the lords are not waging war against the Turks. But put your hand into your bosom, and you will catch a Turk there." III, 1195.

b. As it affects man. Cursing means also "to invoke upon one's self or others the wrath and punishment of God." Peter sought to prop up his lie that he did not know Jesus by a curse.⁵⁾ Matt. 26, 74. He must have said that he would rather be damned than be a disciple of Jesus. The Jews became guilty of the same offense when they assumed the guilt of Jesus' death. Matt. 27, 25.⁶⁾ On the other hand, the curse may be employed to draw down on another some dire calamity such as only God can inflict. It then becomes a summons to God to carry out the wicked wish of men. David twice became the object of such a hideous attack: at the beginning of his career Goliath, at the end of his life Shimei cursed him. Both called on a higher power than themselves to destroy David. 1 Sam. 17, 43; 2 Sam. 16, 13.

c. The impropriety of cursing for Christians is declared by James. (3, 9, 10.) Every man was given his tongue for a different purpose than for cursing his fellow-men. The wild and wayward worldling does not recognize the noble mission of human speech to glorify God, and praise every creature of God. But the Christian

to a minister of the Gospel by refusing him his temporal support. Such contempt God regards as directed against Himself.

5) Wilke Grimm paraphrases *καταθεσται* thus: *extremis diris de-vo-rare*, *graviter caseerare*, to consign oneself to eternal perdition, to call down grievous harm on oneself.

6) "His blood be on us and on our children" means: "The consequences of this condemnation, be they what they may, we are willing to suffer. Let God visit it, if He will, upon us and our children; we and they will cheerfully bear the penalty. A mad and impious imprecation!" (Williams.) Pilate had just washed his hands to signify to the people that he would not have the blood of Jesus staining his hand; he deprecated the punishment of God that might be visited on the murderers of Jesus. The Jews invited that punishment.

does. It follows, then, that a Christian cannot curse and be a Christian.⁷⁾

d. God has declared that He will punish those who blaspheme and curse. In the theocratic government He not only pilloried the blasphemer by denouncing "sin upon him," and making the people turn away from him as from a doomed man, but He also decreed the shameful death by stoning against these malefactors. Lev. 24, 15, 16. He avenged Himself upon the uncouth Philistine braggart by a little stone hurled from the contemptible sling of a shepherd boy. Shimei met his fate by the sword of David's officer. The Jews lived to see their city destroyed, and their nation scattered, as it is to this day, throughout the earth. Peter, by his curse, was merged in grief, from which only the mighty hand of his merciful Lord could pluck him. Those who curse have grave reasons for remembering God's warning: "Be not deceived," Gal. 6, 7. Do not let any one persuade you that cursing is something innocent or even manly.

2. Swearing. Qu. 23—25.

a. Its meaning: "to call upon God as the witness of truth or the avenger of falsehood." The oath, according to 2 Cor. 1, 23, is an appeal to God (*τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι*). God's help is invoked as a witness (*μάρτυρα*).⁸⁾ His omniscience, holiness, and justice qualify Him for being the unerring Observer of truth and the impartial Recorder of the same. With his appeal to God the maker of an oath stakes his eternal happiness (*ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν*). He is so sure that he is right that he wagers his soul to God, who alone has the mastery over the soul, and, as the final Arbiter of men's eternal destiny, "is able to save and to destroy," Jas. 4, 12. The oath, then, is a solemn matter, and should be treated as such.

b. "It is to be noted that there are two kinds of swearing, good and evil." III, 1195.

7) The apostle emphasizes the inconsistency of which Christians become guilty by cursing, and that in two ways: 1) they "bless God," they bestow most endearing and affectionate names on Him, such as "Father," and then they proceed to curse the Father's other children, their brethren, who bear the same stamp and lineage with them, being descended from God, who made them all after His likeness. 2) They dedicate the mouth that had become consecrated to God by blessing to the devil by cursing. They are guilty of duplicity. Surely, "these things ought not so to be."

8) The rendering "record" which the A. V. gives of the term is to be understood in the sense of "attestation or testimony," as: He bore record of his manliness.

a. Swearing is enjoined and sanctioned by God when it tends to His glory and the welfare of our fellow-men. Three demands are made upon us in Deut. 6, 13: to fear the Lord, to serve Him, and to swear by His name. The last of these is related to the two former as an effect to its cause. Swearing an oath is a divine service, a worship rendered to God, by whose name, therefore, the oath is made. And this service flows from that fear of God which the Law inculcates. Genuine oaths are made only by God-fearing men, who have the honor of God, His institutions, His Word, His Church, at heart. Accordingly, Jesus did not hesitate to affirm with an oath that He was the Son of God. Not to swear an oath under the circumstances in which He was placed at the time would have been tantamount to a denial of the truth. — "God Himself not infrequently makes oath in the prophets, saying: 'As I live, saith the Lord,' Ezek. 33, 11; also in Ps. 110, 4 we read: 'The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent,' and Ps. 132, 11: 'The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David.' Thus Christ swears an oath in the Gospels: the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, all the saints swear, and have sworn, oaths. This is a commendable action because it is done in matters that concern our salvation. Accordingly, whenever a person says or does something that is an aid toward salvation, he should swear an oath in order that men may believe him, if there is reason to fear that otherwise they will not believe him. Thus the apostle swears Rom. 1, 9 that he had often proposed to himself to visit the Romans. What reason for swearing did he have except that it might conduce to their salvation to believe him? — that they might know him to be a faithful pastor and not a mercenary, and have the confidence that he was actuated by genuine love. Thus we read in Ps. 63, 11: 'Every one that sweareth by Him shall glory.'" III, 1196. — That a true oath benefits men, and is of great service in their temporal relations, is shown by Heb. 6, 16.⁹⁾ It ends many a strife. "The reason why God is pleased with an oath of this kind is because by it men take a

9) The scope of this text is to show why *God* should be believed who He swears an oath: even a man's oath is accepted and closes a controversy (*ἀντιλογία*). *Βεβαίωσις* is best rendered, with Deissmann, "guarantee." "The meaning is that when one man disputes the assertion of another an oath puts an end to the contradiction, and serves for confirmation. *Πάντος* is added, not to indicate the universal deference paid to the oath (Bleek), but the completeness of its effect: no room is left for contradiction. *Ὁ ὅρκος* the generic article, best translated 'an oath.'" (Dods. "The oath has two results, negative and positive: it finally stops all contradiction; and it establishes that which it attests." (Westcott.)

appeal to His truth, and manifest their faith in Him, and for His sake restore peace and unity among the parties to the oath. Accordingly, God is being worshiped by this sacred act, and the work of the devil, strife and quarreling, is being defeated. For a person who refuses to believe you and be at peace with you, will believe you for the sake of God's name which you invoke, and be at peace with you. For this reason we cannot accord this honor (of swearing by him) to any one else besides God." III. 1196. — Elimelech's oath to Abraham that he would find a wife for Isaac from among Abraham's kinsfolk greatly eased the troubled soul of the aged patriarch. (Gen. 24, 3.¹⁰) — Calvin rightly remarks in his comment on Heb. 6, 16: "This passage teaches that there is a legitimate use for the oath among Christians. This must be borne in mind over and against those fanatical people who would wantonly abrogate the rule which God has prescribed in His law, *viz.*, that we should religiously swear an oath."

b. Evil swearing, that is forbidden, is "false, blasphemous, and frivolous swearing, and all oaths in uncertain things." False oaths (perjury) occur "among those who take oaths in courts of justice, where one side falsifies against the other. God's name cannot be more abused than when used to support falsehood and deceit." *Large Cat.*, p. 397. A blasphemous oath was that of Peter, Matt. 26, 27, of Herod, Matt. 14, 6—9, and of the band of conspirators who had agreed to fast until they had slain Paul. God was invoked by

10) The peculiar ceremony with which Abraham desires his servant to make oath to him is mentioned again only chap. 47, 29. "This ancient form of adjuration, to which nothing analogous can elsewhere be discovered — the practise alleged to exist among the modern Egyptian Bedouins of placing the hand upon the *membrum virile* in solemn forms of asseveration not forming an exact parallel — was probably originated by the patriarch. The thigh, as the source of posterity (chap. 35, 11: 46, 26; Ex. 1, 5), has been regarded as pointing to Abraham's future descendants (Keil, Kalisch, Lange), and in particular to Christ, the promised Seed (Theodoret, Jerome, Augustine, Luther [1, 1656], Ainsworth, Bush, Wardsworth), and the oath to be equivalent to a swearing by Him that was to come. By others the thigh has been viewed as euphemistically put for the generative organ, upon which the sign of circumcision was placed, and the oath as an adjuration by the sign of the covenant (Jonathan, Jarchi, Tuch). A third interpretation considers the thigh as symbolizing lordship or authority, and the placing of the hand under it as tantamount to an oath of fealty and allegiance to a superior (Aben Ezra, Rosenmueller, Calvin, Murphy). Other explanations are modifications of the above." (*Whitelaw.*)

these oaths to sanction abjuration of the true faith in Jesus and murder. Moreover, the oath of Herod was frivolous, considering the occasion on which it was given, and the unreasonable promise that was confirmed by it. The King swore to bestow half his kingdom on a whore. Lastly, there was an element of uncertainty connected with both Herod's oath and that of the would-be assassins of Paul: the King did not foresee the devilish use that could be made of his solemn promise, and the conspirators undertook to determine what God alone determines, Paul's span of life, and their own power of endurance.—On frivolous swearing and oaths in uncertain things our Lord instructs us in Matt. 5, 33—37.¹¹⁾ “The other kind of

11) The Lord had referred to such texts as Lev. 9, 12; Num. 30, 3; Deut. 23, 22. “What is wrong in these *dicta*? Nothing save what is left unsaid. The scribes misplaced the emphasis. They had a great deal to say, in sophistical style, of the oaths that were binding and not binding, nothing about the fundamental requirement of truth in the inward parts. Therefore, Jesus goes back on the previous question: Should there be any need for oaths?—Ὁλως: emphatic = *ταυτελῶς*, don't swear *at all*. Again an unqualified statement, to be taken not in the letter as a new law, but in the spirit as inculcating such a love of truth that, so far as we are concerned, there shall be no need of oaths. In civil life the most truthful man has to take an oath because of the untruth and consequent distrust prevailing in the world, and in doing so he does not sin against Christ's teaching. Christ Himself took an oath before the high priest. What follows in vv. 34—36 is directed against the casuistry, which laid stress on the words *τῷ κυρίῳ*, and evaded obligation by taking oaths in which the divine name was not mentioned: by heaven, earth, Jerusalem, or by one's own head. Jesus points out that all such oaths involved a reference to God. This is sufficiently obvious in the case of the first three, not so clear in the case of the fourth.—*Λευκὴν ἢ μέλαιναν*. White is the color of old age, black of youth. We cannot alter the color of our hair so as to make our head look young or old. *A fortiori* we cannot bring on our head any curse by perjury, of which hair suddenly whitened might be a symbol. Providence alone can blast our life. The oath by the head is a direct appeal to God. All these oaths are binding, therefore, says Jesus; but what I most wish to impress on you is: Do not swear at all. Observe the use of *μήτε* (not *μηδέ*) to connect these different evasive oaths as forming a homogeneous group. Winer endorses the view of Herrmann in Viger that *οὔτε* and *μήτε* are *adjunctival*, *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* *disjunctival*, and says that the latter add negation to negation, while the former divide a single negation into parts. Jesus first thinks of these evasive oaths as a bad class, then specifies them one after the other. Away with them one and all, and let your word be *ναὶ ναί*, *οὐ οὐ*. That is, if you want to give assurance, let it not be by an oath, but by simple repetition of your

swearing is evil, and this, again, occurs in two forms. One is habitual swearing, by which reverence for the divine name is diminished because it is being constantly used. We Germans have a habit of saying: By God, Verily, Forsooth, As surely as God is in heaven, By God and all the saints, By the living God, By the holy God, By the precious cross, By the precious blood, By the cross of God, Great wounds, By the precious agony, that is, By the suffering of Christ, it is so. Likewise, we have a habit of cursing: May the devil get me! May the devil break my neck! May I be a castaway! So help me God! Upon my soul, upon my conscience, upon my truth and honor, upon my priesthood! These, and many similar expressions, alas! are uttered so frequently by many that nearly every other word of theirs is such an oath. Here is where fathers and mothers should observe their children and domestics; for it is an exceedingly bad habit and contrary to this commandment. — For the sake of simple folk the question might be raised in this connection whether such an oath as, Verily, I speak the truth, has anything to do with the name of God. I answer: Yes; for the name of God is truth, because He is truth. For in this manner Paul swears, Rom. 9, 1, upon his truth and conscience. Although it might seem as if such swearing had been forbidden, because the conscience is not the name of God, still, because unnecessary swearing is just as sinful as not swearing by the name of God, or swearing by something that is not God, even when telling the truth, Christ in Matt. 5, 34—36 considers all such oaths relating to God. Hence it is plain that a person swearing by something that belongs to God or is ascribed to Him swears by God, of whom, and in whom, and for whom are all things. Rom. 11, 36. — The other form is perjury, *viz.*, when a person knowingly and purposely swears a false oath. This is a very grievous sin, and rarely

yes and no. Grotius interprets: Let your *yea* or *nay* in *word* be a *yea* or *nay* in *deed*; be as good as your word, even unsupported by an oath. This brings the version of Christ's saying in Matthew into closer correspondence with Jas. 5, 12. Beza, with whom Achelis (*Bergpredigt*) agrees, renders, 'Let your affirmative discourse be a simple *yea*, and your negative, *nay*.' — Τὸ δὲ περισσόν, the surplus, what goes beyond these simple words. — Ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, hardly 'from the Evil One,' though many ancient and modern interpreters, including Meyer, have so understood it. Meyer says, the neuter 'of evil' gives a very insipid meaning. I think, however, that Christ expresses Himself mildly out of respect for the necessity of oaths in a world full of falsehood. I know, He means to say, that in certain circumstances something beyond *yea* and *nay* will be required of you. But it comes of evil, the evil of untruthfulness. See that the evil be not in you." (Bruce.) Comp. Luther, III, 1200 ff.

remains unpunished in this life. If you doubt this, ask the perjured." Continuing, Luther exhaustively describes the sin of perjury. III. 1196 ff. In his *Large Cat.* Luther calls attention to a form of perjury that "is especially prevalent in marriage affairs, where two secretly betroth themselves to one another, and afterward abjure." p. 398.

3. *Using witchcraft.*¹²⁾ Qu. 26.

a. Its meaning: "using God's name or Word without His command and promise to perform supernatural things." This thing is known by many other names. In our days "magic" is coming into use as the proper term to designate the uncouth practises that fall under the head of witchcraft. In all ages there have been persons who have accomplished feats that could not be explained by knowledge which all men possess, or can possess. They would cure diseases, stop the flow of blood, put out a fire, cause things to disappear or appear suddenly. But in performing such feats they would not use the ordinary means which the physician, the fire brigade, etc., use. They would murmur strange words, pronounce a certain formula, move their hands in mysterious gestures, prescribe the use of things which naturally have no power to produce effects such as they sought to attain. These practises they made to appear very holy by using God's name, Bible-texts, baptismal water, communion wafers, etc., for performing them. Since God has nowhere in His Book commanded such a use of His name, nor promised His help to those who thus use His name, but has rather forbidden and cursed these practises, we are to regard such unnatural doings not as coming from God, but from the devil. They are "satanic arts"; people practising them are servants of Satan and in league with him. God suffers men to be duped by these mysterious feats for a punishment to those who have forsaken Him. 2 Thess. 2, 8—12. /

b. Its forms. The story of the Egyptian sorcerers whom Pharaoh pitted against Moses and Aaron, and who turned a staff into a serpent and produced frogs, is useful in showing, not only the variety of stunning tricks which people who practise hidden arts can perform, but also that their mysterious feats are imitations of true miracles.

12) The term, and its cognates, such as "wizard," connects with the Anglo-Saxon *witan*, to see, and *vita*, to know. From the standpoint of the ignorant masses any person of more than ordinary intelligence and information seemed to possess secret powers. Where ignorance is the natural state, knowledge always appears supernatural. Not all that passes for a supernatural attainment is such.

The devil always is God's ape. But God defeats his lying signs and wonders. Aaron's rod, turned into a serpent, devoured the serpents which the sorcerers had produced, perhaps by snake-charming. When they failed to produce lice, they acknowledged themselves defeated by "the finger of God." Ex. 7. 8.—The Catechism mentions among the forms of witchcraft chiefly three which are common in our day: 1. "conjuring" (now an archaic term), which means charming, enchanting, bewitching by means of incantations, charms, etc.; 2. "fortune-telling," in which a pretense of the knowledge of future events is made by the performer, who consults the lines in a person's hands (palmistry), cards, coffee-suds, etc. (clairvoyancy); 3. "consulting the dead," which is practised as a form of religion by our modern Spiritualists, who pretend to receive communications from the world of departed spirits by means of written characters, sound-signals, and even visions. The experience of Saul with the witch of Endor in the night before his suicide during the battle of Gilboa contains one element that deserves to be emphasized when the story is recounted: Saul himself saw and heard nothing. It was the woman who declared she saw strange shapes rising out of the ground. If she really did, God had no hand in this miracle, because He had forsaken Saul some time ago, and refused to answer him. 1 Sam. 28. The practise of magic was so wide-spread in Israel in those days that the king had in his better days sought to suppress it by special laws.—The Catechism suggests that the three forms of witchcraft which it mentions do not exhaust the subject. Deut. 18, 10—12 refers to many other practises, the exact character of each and every one of which it is now difficult to define.¹³⁾

13) The first practise named in this text does not necessarily refer to magic. קִסָּם קִסָּמִים, "one that useth divination," describes attempts made to discover the unknown by arrows, entrails, or teraphim, *i. e.*, domestic idols, Ezek. 21, 26. מַעֲוֵן, "an observer of times," is from "a verb which signifies to cover, to use covert arts, to practise sorcery; though some derive it from the noun עָנָן, a thick cloud, and explain it as 'interpreter of clouds,' while others trace it to עַיִן, the eye, and explain it as 'one who cheats by optical fascinations,' or 'one who divines by inspection—an augur.'" — מַחַשׁ, "an enchanter." Gen. 44, 5; Num. 24, 1, show that this term describes one who divines by sign. Some have connected the word with נָחָשׁ, a serpent, and interpreted the above term as referring to ophiomancy, divining by serpents. — מַכְשֶׁף, "a witch." The LXX renders this term *φαραζός*, the Vulgate, *maleficus*. The reference is probably "to one who pretended to cure diseases, or procured some desired result by nostrums and philters. . . . The English word 'witch' is now restricted

c. In the works of witchcraft we face the blasphemous defiance which the devils offer to God. The situation in Egypt at the time of the plagues vividly portrays the rebellious spirit that animated Pharaoh and his magicians against Jehovah. God overthrew them. Canaan in the days of Moses, like pagan countries in our day, was overrun with magic. A part of Joshua's mission was to extirpate the sorcerers. What an effect Paul's preaching had on the witches at Ephesus is told Acts 19, 19. Often pagan magicians have, like Simon Magus, employed the name of the Triune, or of Jesus, because they believed that they could work more powerful charms with these. The face of Christians must be sternly set against all "satanic arts."

4. *Lying or deceiving by God's name.* Qu. 27.

a. Its meaning. — "Lying" = knowingly telling a falsehood; "deceiving" = causing evil to appear good. These practises, however, are here considered, not *per se*, but in so far as they occur among people who are using the name and the Word of God, and pretend union and intimacy with God while they engage in these practises. Religious lies and holy frauds are here scored. "To lie and deceive is in itself

to the *jeune* practiser of unlawful arts: formerly it was applied to *magos* as well, if not chiefly." — חֲכַר חֲבַר, "a charmer." "The verb here used primarily means to bind, and the species of magic indicated is probably that practised by binding certain knots, whereby it was supposed that the curse or blessing, as the case might be, was bound on its object: this was accompanied apparently with incantation (Ps. 58, 5). Comp. Engl. *spell-bound*." — שֹׁאֵל אוֹב, "a consulter with familiar spirits." The exact meaning is: "one who asks or inquires of an Ob, that is, a Python, or divining spirit." "This spirit was supposed to be in the person of the conjurer, and to be able to reveal to him what was secret or hidden in the future (Lev. 20, 27; 1 Sam. 28, 7, 8; Acts 16, 16). The notion of 'a familiar spirit,' i. e., a spirit not dwelling in a person, but with which he is intimate, — generally the spirit who formerly lived on earth, — is a modern notion not known to Scripture. The persons here referred to were probably ventriloquists (LXX renders: *ἐγγιστοφρονες*), and used their faculty in this respect, pretending that they had within them a spirit which they could consult, and by which they could predict what would happen, or reveal what was hid." — יֹדְעֵי, "a wizard." "The English word 'wizard' did not originally convey the idea of anything evil in the person of whom it was used. Milton applies it to the Magi who came to worship at Bethlehem; it meant merely 'the wise one,' or 'the knowing one'; and thus is an exact equivalent for the Hebrew word here used." — רֹשֵׁשׁ אֱלִי־הַמָּתִים, "a necromancer." "One who professed to call up the dead," as did the witch at Endor. (Alexander.)

a great sin, but is greatly aggravated by attempting a justification, and where, to confirm it, the name of God is invoked and is used as a cloak for shame, so that from a single lie a double lie, nay, manifold lies, result." *Large Cat.*, p. 398.

b. Its forms. — Following Luther's Sermons on Ex. 19 and 20, of the year 1526, and an earlier course of sermons on the Ten Commandments, which he preached to the people of Wittenberg in 1516, our Catechism assumes two forms of religious lying and deceiving: heresy and hypocrisy. (See III, 1072 ff.)

a. False doctrine is preached in the name of God, and from the Bible, by people who claim a commission from God to do so. The name and Word of God are used by these people, as a hunter uses a decoy to attract his game, and to cover up his dangerous design, or as a lewd person decks herself out in beautiful garments. Jer. 23, 31 describes the process of "prophets," *i. e.*, preachers, who appeal to God ("He saith") to induce their hearers to accept their own fabrications. For what they say they have turned out with their tongue, using that like a workman uses a tool. "The false prophets adopt the same forms as the true; but they are to them only forms." (*Cheyne.*) The most terrible indictment of the practises of these people is found in Matt. 23, where our Lord witheringly arraigns those most sanctionious liars of His day, the Pharisees. Vv. 1—12 exhibit their character, vv. 13—31 denounce eight woes against their hypocrisy, and vv. 32—39 predict an appalling future for them. The Roman Catholic Church, with its spectacular holiness, is the true successor to the Pharisees. But also in Protestant Churches false teaching is offered with a great show of reverence for God and the Bible.

b. Heresy is, in most instances, allied with hypocrisy. But we embrace more by the term hypocrisy than efforts to adorn false doctrine with the Word and name of God. These same holy things are used to cloak ungodly life. Hypocrisy¹⁴ is sham holiness; an angel without and a devil within. In Matt. 15, 8 our Lord quotes Is. 29, 13 with a slight variation. He addresses people who "use the prescribed forms of worship, guard with much care the letter of Scripture, observe its legal and ceremonial enactments, are strict in the practise of all outward formalities." (*Williams.*) But they engage in these sacred acts without any inward devotion. — The Sermon on the Mount culminated in a denunciation of religious hypocrisy, Matt. 7, 15. The people who say, "Lord, Lord," acknowledge themselves servants and profess loyalty. But their show of reverential sub-

14) The Greek *ὑποκριτής* was an actor.

mission cannot deceive God, who shuts them out from the goal for which they seem to strive. No one has a right to call God his Lord who fails to do God's will. Hypocrisy makes its mouth perform astonishing feats of lip-service, but is the worst sluggard in enacting its beautiful sentiments. The reason is: the hypocrite knows he is speaking and acting a lie which he does not believe himself. Why should he trouble himself about doing what he professes? In the early Christian Church Ananias and Sapphira are the representatives of this wicked use of the divine name. "No one is so bold as to boast to all the world of the wickedness he has perpetrated, but wishes everything to be done secretly, and without any one being aware of it. Then, if any one be arraigned, the name of God must suffer for it, and change the villainy into godliness and the shame into honor. This is the common course of the world, which, like a great deluge, has inundated all lands." *Large Cat.*, p. 398.

III. The Injunction. Qu. 28.

A. When God forbids taking His name in vain, He implies in the very prohibition that there is a use of His name that is not vain, useless, but commendable. He has revealed His name for the very purpose that men might know how to address Him. "Since the use of His holy name for falsehood or wickedness is here forbidden, it necessarily follows that *we are, on the other hand, commanded to employ it for truth and for all good.*" *Large Cat.*, p. 399. By eliminating every misuse of His name, God establishes its proper use:

1. In behalf of the truth;
2. In the helpful service of love to our fellow-men.

B. To the four ways in which God's name is misused Luther opposes four suggestions for its right and proper use, all of them having been taken from the Scriptures.

1. "Calling upon God in trouble." The Law of God was given to man when there was no trouble. Since sin entered the world, man's relation to God has been changed. But the Law has not been changed. Even from out of his sinful state man must show reverence to God. It is a mark of Luther's fine spiritual tact that he has mentioned the invocation of divine help as the first of the proper uses of God's name. And Luther is admirably in touch with the Scriptures in thus heading the series of our duties under the Second Commandment with a reminder that we must summon God to our side in our need. Ps. 50 is a didactic poem on the worship of God. After rejecting the mechanical worship of ceremonialism, God in v. 15 suggests as the true worship which He seeks to obtain from man petitions and

eulogies. Not to tell our troubles to God is a new sin on top of those which have brought on our trouble. Every affliction is a chastisement for our remissness to make God our confidant, our adviser and rescuer. On the other hand, laying our needs before Him, as Hannah did, is an act of the finest worship. God has commended that act by having Hannah's and many another sufferer's prayer recorded in Scripture.

2. "Pray." This refers to the regular practise of prayer in private and public. The entire Third Part of our Catechism will be devoted to the study of this subject, which God has commended to us in an emphatic statement, which contains beautiful images and a forceful climax, Matt. 7, 7. Though trouble may prompt the acts here enjoined, it is not necessarily in distress only that God would have us do what He enjoins in this text. This text rather describes the habitual attitude of His children toward Him. Hannah's continued prayer may serve to illustrate also this use of God's name.

3. "Praise." God is such a grand and lovable object to contemplate that a person who meditates upon Him, as David does Ps. 103, 1, feels impelled to break forth in praises of God.¹⁵⁾ Such praise God meant to elicit from man by revealing Himself to him. Hannah's prayer is full of praise.

4. "Give thanks." This implies the consciousness of favors and gifts which one has received from God, and which are highly prized, not only for their own sake, but also because of the good, generous, merciful Giver from whom they have come. Ps. 118, 1; 106, 1, and many other texts show that the Church of the Old Covenant was fairly trained for this duty. And here, once more, Hannah's example is instructive.

"For this end it is also of service that we be in the habit of daily commending ourselves to God, with soul and body, wife, child, servants, and all that we have, against all necessities that may occur; whence also the blessing and thanksgiving at meals, and other prayers, morning and evening, have originated and remain in use. Likewise also the practise of children to cross themselves and exclaim, when anything monstrous or terrible is seen or heard: 'Lord God, protect us!' 'Help, dear Lord Jesus!' etc. Thus, too, if any one experience unexpected good, however trivial, that he say: 'God be praised and thanked for bestowing this on me!'" *Large Cat.*, p. 400 f.

15) "Bless" (בִּרַךְ) in this place, of course, cannot mean to bestow a blessing or favor, but to exalt, extol, glorify, as good, sublime, blessed. It is, in effect, the same as בָּרַךְ in Ps. 50, 15.

IV. *The Fulfilment of the Duties Laid Down in This and the Succeeding Commandments.* Qu. 19.

Luther has opened his explanation of each commandment with a statement of something that reads like an injunction, *viz.*, "We should fear and love God," but is really intended for another purpose. It explains the condition of the heart that is needed for a proper execution of the various duties named in the commandments. Fear and love of God are a prerequisite for all service which the Law demands. Accordingly, no one can claim to have done his duty under the Law who has not done what he has done, or shunned what he has shunned, from the motive of profound and filial reverence, and cordial and childlike affection, for the great and sovereign, good and glorious Lawgiver. D.

BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.:—

1. *BRIEFE VON C. F. W. WALTHER.* 2. Bd.: Briefe aus den Jahren 1865—71. IX and 236 pages. \$1.

It is gratifying that the compiler and editor of this historically and spiritually valuable collection of letters of one of the foremost Lutheran theologians of America, Prof. Fuerbringer, has been encouraged by the universal favor with which the first volume was received to continue his painstaking and tactful labors, and to promise us (?) another volume. The present volume contains 130 letters, arranged in chronological order (December 30, 1865, to September 14, 1871). Besides the glimpses which we get in these letters of the man and the theologian in Walther, we are impressed with the widely extending influence which he exercised, and the intense and varied interest which he displays in a period when Lutheran aversions and convergencies are beginning to show in America. Within the period covered by these letters fall the Colloquium with the Iowa Synod, the approaching understanding with the Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Ohio Synods, and a quickening of Lutheran consciousness in Saxony and Bavaria, besides a growing cordiality between the Norwegian and the Missouri Synod. Serious, yea, momentous affairs of the Church or of individual members form the burden of this volume, and the subjects in hand are treated with a stateliness that is become second nature with Walther. But there are many lively touches of purely human interest scattered through these pages that will attract the reader no less than the graver contents. We hope that this enterprise will be carried to completion by the publication of all the letters of Walther that are available.

4. *DIE LEHRE DER SCHRIFT VOM EWIGEN LEBEN.* Von P. Albert H. Brauer. 96 pages. Paper, 30 cts. Bound in cloth, gilt edge, 60 cts.

The impression of solemnity produced in the reader by this reprint of a synodical paper on the Life Everlasting, which the author read before the Illinois District Synod thirty years ago, is deepened by the intelligence which the editor, his brother, conveys to us, *viz.*, that the author himself has entered that state of our ultimate existence of which he spoke to his brethren. The volume is a fitting memorial of the service which the author rendered his Church while living.*

5. *THE REAL TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM.* A Treatise by E. C. L. Schulze. 86 pages. 40 cts.

With portions of this treatise the readers of our German church-paper, *Der Lutheraner*, are acquainted. The subject of Socialism, in which the author interested us in his German articles, has been expanded in this volume so as to embrace every essential phase of this malevolent modern vagary that enters our political life, and yet is not a purely political issue; our church-life, and yet is the practical negation of that life; our home-life, though it bids fair to take the true idea of the home away from us; our individual life, though it is bent upon crushing individuality. This may seem a formidable indictment, however, only to such as do not know Socialism, as have not studied Socialism from its authentic sources and acknowledged authorities. The pointed citations which the author offers for his theses we consider a most valuable feature of his dissertation.

6. *THE DIFFERENCE.* A Popular Guide to Denominational History and Doctrine. By I. G. Monson. 74 pages. 50 cts.

This treatise divides into two parts. In the first, the origin of Churches and cults outside of the Lutheran Church is briefly told, while the second part arrays the errors of the false beliefs against the true teaching of the Scriptures, after the method of Guenther's *Symbolik*.

7. *THE SHADOW OF A CRIME.* Based on the German *Seile der Liebe* of Alfred Ira. By Mary E. Ireland. 127 pages. 30 cts.

This latest addition to the new series of juvenile books which the Concordia Publishing House is putting out is a good, clean story with an excellent moral, told in a fascinating manner.

8. A doctrinal paper on *THE FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, CONCERNING JUSTIFICATION*, read before the Central Illinois District Synod by Rev. E. Flach. 46 pages. 15 cts.

9. A doctrinal paper on *THE REFUTATION OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH*, read before the Central District Synod by Rev. Wm. Moll. 47 pages. 16 cts.

* The proceeds from the sale of this volume are set aside for the author's widow.

8. A doctrinal paper on *THE VERDICT OF THE BASIC CONFESSION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH ON THE ROMISH MASS*, read before the Southern Illinois District Synod by Prof. Dau. 63 pages. 18 cts.
9. A doctrinal paper on *THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE SPIRIT AND THE FLESH*, read before the Kansas District Synod (first installment) by Prof. M. Gracner. 25 pages. 12 cts.
10. A doctrinal paper on *THE CORRECT USE OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL*, read before the Nebraska District Synod by Rev. W. Mahler. 60 pages. 18 cts.
11. A doctrinal paper on *FAMILY WORSHIP*, read before the California and Nevada District Synod by Rev. E. Rudnick. 47 pages. 15 cts.
12. A doctrinal paper on *POPEY IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND THE DAWN OF A NEW DAY*, by Prof. T. Gracner, read before the Western District Synod. 58 pages. 18 cts.
13. A doctrinal paper on the question: *WHAT DO THE SCRIPTURES STATE REGARDING THE LAST DAY OF THE WORLD?* by Rev. P. Gracner, read before the Canada District Synod. 33 pages. 10 cts.
14. *KONFIRMATIONSKATALOG* und Verzeichniss der Konfirmationsscheine. Concordia Publishing House. 1916. 48 pages.

The *American Lutheran Publishing Bureau*, 901 Summit Ave. Jersey City, N. J., has issued a forceful tract: *WHY GO TO CHURCH?* by Rev. P. Lindemann. 25 cts. per hundred.

Northwestern Publishing House, Milwaukee, Wis., has, in a tract of 18 pages, *MARTIN LUTHER*. Excerpted from *Beacon Light of History*. Edited by William Dallmann. 5 cts.

Rev. F. W. Henninger, 3619 Iowa Ave., St. Louis, has prepared the libretto for a *JUBILEE CANTATA* for the Four-hundredth Birthday of the Reformation, in three parts. The leading poetic idea elaborated in this collection of choruses and recitatives is the illuminating effect of the Reformation. ("At Eventide There Shall Be Light, or The Holy Gospel's Halloween.") The music is to be obtained by a prize contest of composers. 25 cts.

Saenger Publishing Co., St. Louis, has issued Vol. IV, No. 13 of *SAENGERBOTE*. 15 cts.

Schriftenterslein, Zwickau, Saxony, continues its seasonable weekly publications by the following new issues:—

1. *ZUM JAHRESTAG DES KRIEGSANFANGES*. A sermon from Ps. 65, 2—4 by Rev. H. G. Amling, of Berlin. 12 pages. 10 Pf.

2. *DANKPREDIGT ZUR KRIEGSJAHRSWENDE*. A sermon from Ps. 118, 21 by *Rev. M. Hempsing*, of Niederplanitz. 16 pages. 10 Pf.
3. *TROSTPREDIGT UEBER JES. 38, 17*. By *Rev. O. Willkomm*, of Niederplanitz. 16 pages. 10 Pf.
4. *SEID GETROST! FUERCHTET EUCH NICHT!* An exhortation by *K.*, based on Matt. 14, 27. 8 pages. 5 Pf.
5. *KOMMT UND LASST UNS CHRISTUM EHREN!* A Christmas greeting to the soldier in the trenches. Contributions by *M. Willkomm* and *Fr. Gillhoff*. 40 pages. 25 Pf.

The Lutheran Publishing Co., Ltd., of Hochkirch, Victoria, Australia, has issued in an English edition the instructive paper of *Rev. E. Darso* on the *ADVANTAGES AND BLESSINGS OF SYNODICAL FELLOWSHIP IN THE TRUE LUTHERAN CHURCH*, which was read before the Queensland District of the Lutheran Synod in Australia. 25 pages. 6 pence.

Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., sends us the *REPORT OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION* of the Association of the English Churches in the Augustana (Swedish) Synod. 64 pages of minutes plus statistical tables.

Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O.:—

1. *THE INFLUENCE OF LUTHERANISM OUTSIDE OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH*. By *Jacob A. Dell*. 16 pages. 6 cts.
Belongs in the class of studies of the remoter effects of Luther's work, always to be taken *cum grano*.
2. *SERMONS ON THE EISENACH GOSPELS*. By *Rev. J. Sheatsley*. 579 pages. \$2.50.

A preacher must have something to say, and take time to say it. Both conditions are fulfilled in the 65 sermons in this volume. The sermons have come out of the text, which, as a rule, has been well divided. The style is plain; good English and direct address characterize this preacher. The sermons cover about ten pages, large octavo, each, and must have required forty minutes for their delivery. The exposition of the texts treated does not produce any remarkable results. There is nothing labored in these sermons. The great dominant facts in the life of a Christian, sin and grace, are woven into the discourse. Greater precision and a more searching interpretation of the text is desirable. For instance, in "The Baptist's Call to Repentance" repentance is characterized as a "change," which is correct. p. 22 f. It is necessary now, in order to lead the thought of the hearer aright, that the change be correctly described. The author cites as an instance of repentance the publican, who went down to his house "justified and a different man from what he had been," and then adds the instance of Zacchaeus, who "repented in the sycamore tree, and then restored any ill-gotten gain fourfold, and gave half his goods to the poor." Here the "change" which justifying faith works, and which affects only the sinner's standing with God

required separate and exhaustive treatment. Mingling justifying faith with sanctifying faith creates a confusion of serious consequences. And the author could have well afforded to speak of Zachaeus in a later division, where he treats the fruits of faith by which the "change" is made evident to man as "the second thing" in the Baptist's call. — "The Good Signs of the Times" (p. 69 ff.) are poorly stated. One need not be a pessimist to place a question-mark against every hopeful item which the author enumerates. Looking a little deeper into the movement toward Christ which the author sees in the social, commercial, and political world of to-day would have yielded different results. The use which the average modern social worker is making of Christ does not benefit him at all. He might substitute Seneca for his Christ, and suffer no loss. The author has explained this matter much better on the "True Brotherhood of Jesus," especially on pages 389 to 392.

3. *CATECHISM BIBLE NARRATIVES*. A Series of Bible Narratives on the Five Chief Parts of Luther's Smaller Catechism. For use in Lutheran Sunday-schools. By *Rev. Geo. W. Lose*. 410 pages. 75 cts.

The plan of attaching the truths of the Catechism to a Bible-story which, when properly told, is seen to contain those truths is a good one. It is perhaps the only feasible plan which will enable an ordinary Sunday-school teacher to attempt the teaching of the Catechism to his class. And that the teaching of the Catechism is a *conditio sine qua non* for raising sound Lutherans no Lutheran will question. Different teachers may prefer a different Bible-story for setting forth a given truth of the Catechism, but the selections here offered are usually to the point. For "conversion," *e. g.*, we should have preferred the Pentecostal sermon of Peter and its effects, which the author treats elsewhere, to the story of Saul's Conversion. The extraordinary features connected with this event might lead the catechumen to believe that they must occur in every conversion. This is not saying that Paul's *conversion* was extraordinary.

The General Council Publication Board, Philadelphia, Pa.: — THE PASTOR'S GUIDE, or, Rules and Notes in Pastoral Theology. By *Jacob Fry, D. D., L. H. D., LL. D.* 109 pages.

The method of teaching a seminary class by means of brief, pithy theses that are developed in the lecture of the teacher we would consider an ideal one in every department of the professional study of theology, but chiefly in the department of Pastoral Theology. This method has been followed by the present author. In his booklet, which offers *multum in parvo*, there is on every page material to stimulate reflection and start inquiry, and thus to produce that independence from human authorities and that spiritual virility which we love to see in a manly, "strong" pastor. But there is also much in this little treatise that challenges serious contradiction. The view propounded here regarding "trial sermons" is not helped much by the warning remarks which the author has added. We believe it to be a psychological impossibility for both the preacher and the hearers

of a trial sermon to forget that the preacher is on exhibition. All the information that is necessary in order to insure an intelligent choice of a pastor can be conveyed to the congregation in other ways. Also in the suggestions how the pastoral relationship with a congregation may be terminated, there are some things that smack of the contract system. A chapter on the pastor's duty to advise those who wish to commune should be added. The authority of synod and of the church council seems overemphasized. Strong dissent, too, is aroused by the demand that pastors should officiate at the burial of non-church-members and assisted by a lodge, or assisting a lodge. The danger of rousing hostile sentiment against himself by a refusal to officiate surely is not the only danger which confronts the pastor on such occasions. Nor is it the gravest danger. In this matter, as in the matter of admitting non-Lutherans to one's pulpit, or occupying a non-Lutheran pulpit, the confessional character of the act must be guarded. While it is true that the servant of the Lord owes it to the afflicted to minister to them in their sorrows, it is no less true that he must guard against a profanation of that which is holy, and of making himself the servant of men.—It is plain that there are a number of serious practical issues to be adjusted between the various parts of the American Lutheran Church before unity is reached. Since genuine unity cannot be reached by disregarding, but only by removing, differences, we are glad to have seen a plain expression of views from which we must differ in this book, and to have had an opportunity to call attention to them.

Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn., has issued a tract of 27 pages on the *DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE* (10 cts.), which gives a good survey in the narrowest compass of the negations which one of the most vicious religious vagaries in America opposes to the fundamental truths of Christianity.

The Christian Herald, New York, N. Y.:—

LUTHER IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN RESEARCH. By *Heinrich Boehmer*. Translated by *Chas. F. Huth, Jr.* 318 pp. — *A PICTORIAL LIFE OF LUTHER.* Being the first publication of the collection of rare prints in the possession of *Rev. W. Koepchen*, who also contributes the descriptive text and titles. 89 pages.

The work of Boehmer, the Bonn professor, who has proven one of the ablest apologists of Luther against Roman Catholic attacks, is well known in the original German. While plainly siding with the Reformed against the Lutheran teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, Boehmer has such a commanding grasp of the literature that has grown around the name "Luther," displays such a fine judgment in sifting historical accounts, and exercises such consummate skill in condensing long-winded controversies, and exhibiting the facts of decisive moment, that his work has been indispensable to all who wish to obtain a quick and complete view of the Reformer's character and labors. The translation which Prof. Huth has prepared from the latest edition of Boehmer's book is a good idiomatic rendering. To-

gether with the seventy-five views of personages and events connected with the life-work of Luther which Rev. Koepchen has furnished and described for this volume, Boehmer's treatise is a welcome contribution to the commemorative literature which is beginning to appear, heralding the four-hundredth anniversary of the beginning of the Reformation, which occurs in 1917.

The Colonial Press, Fort Wayne, Ind.:—

THE EDDYITE. A Christian Science Tale by Geo. W. Zanttit. 223 pages.

This novel is eight years old, but its contents are perennially fresh. It portrays in the form of a story the practical workings of Christian Science from inside knowledge and actual experience. To many this tale will prove more convincing than an enumeration of the errors of Christian Science.

National Christian Association, Chicago, Ill.:—

THE CHARACTER, CLAIMS, AND PRACTICAL WORKINGS OF FREEMASONRY. By Rev. C. G. Finney. 272 pages. 75 cts.

This reprint of a publication by the President of Oberlin College, which in its day (1869) created a sensation throughout the country, is a very meritorious enterprise that bespeaks a large patronage in our day, when Freemasonry is regaining its lost strength because the known facts concerning it are not published any more as they were in the decades after the Morgan episode.

Three tracts containing valuable information have been sent us, viz., *ANNUAL OF THE UTAH GOSPEL MISSION OF CLEVELAND* for 1916; 28 pages; *WHAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH HAS DONE TO MEXICO*, by Dr. A. Paganel, Mexico, D. F.; 19 pages; *DIE PROPHETENSPRUECHE UND -ZITATE IM RELIGIOESEN DRAMA DES DEUTSCHEN MITTELALTERS*, von Dr. phil. Joseph Rudwin. 37 pages.

In the *Hibbert Journal* for January, 1916, Count Goblet D'Alviella writes on "Some Moral Aspects and Issues of the Present War"; Sir Frederick Pollock, on "The 'Fight for Right' Movement"; Rt. Rev. J. W. Diggle, D. D., "Against Departmental Religion"; Prof. A. S. Pringle-Patterson, on "Mr. Balfour's 'Theism and Humanism'"; Charles A. Mercier, M. D., on "Vitalism"; Prof. G. T. Ladd, on "The Human Mind vs. The German Mind"; Miss M. E. Robinson, on "The Definite Failure of Christianity, and How it Might Be Retrieved"; Prof. W. A. Brown, on "Is Christianity Practicable?" Prof. E. Armitage, on "The Incompetence of the Mere Scholar to Interpret Christianity"; Rev. Ch. Hargrove, on "The Warlike Context of the Gospels"; C. R. Ashbee, on "Quality vs. Quantity as the Standard of Industry and Life"; Prof. J. Y. Simpson, on "Religion in Russia To-day"; Rev. R. H. Law, on "Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism." Besides these there are 42 pages of "Discussions," surveys and signed reviews.